00023032

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 18 July, 2018

REMAINS

LITERARY AND THEOLOGICAL

OF

CONNOP THIRLWALL

LATE LORD BISHOP OF ST. DAVID'S

REMAINS

LITERARY AND THEOLOGICAL

OF

CONNOP THIRLWALL

LATE LORD BISHOP OF ST. DAVID'S

EDITED

BY J. J. STEWART PEROWNE, D.D.

HONORARY CHAPLAIN TO THE QUEEN; CANON OF LLANDAFF; AND HULSEAN PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY, CAMBRIDGE

23032
ac

VOL. I.—CHARGES

DELIVERED BETWEEN THE YEARS 1842 AND 1866

LONDON
DALDY, ISBISTER & CO.
56, LUDGATE HILL
1877

00023032

PREFACE.

It was Bishop Thirlwall's intention, had his life been spared, to reprint his Charges, and to make a selection from his other writings, for publication. He had expressed a wish to consult me on the subject, and he had suggested that it might be desirable to curtail the Charges by the omission of passages which were of a personal nature, or which he deemed to be of little permanent interest. But he died before the opportunity of our meeting came; and beyond indicating very briefly the kind of selection which he proposed to make, he left no further directions to guide me. It has been a melancholy pleasure to me to fulfil to the best of my ability the wishes of my dear and lamented friend. The short list of Essays and Sermons which he had drawn up has been carefully followed. I have merely added to the number. But I did not feel myself at liberty to cut out a single passage of the Charges. No hand but his own could have done this. They are, therefore, reprinted exactly as they originally appeared.

A fresh perusal of these remarkable Charges has only deepened my impression not merely of the extraordinary ability and learning which everywhere stamp them, but of their permanent value as a philosophical contribution to ecclesiastical literature. They were not merely counsels addressed by the Chief Pastor of a diocese to his clergy, or dissertations of more or less value on topics of transient interest: they were the review by a master mind of all the great questions which have agitated the Church of England during one of the most eventful periods of her history. The Tractarian controversy, the Gorham Case, the controversy

respecting Essays and Reviews, the revival of Convocation, the revision of the Liturgy and of the Authorised Version of the Bible, the Endowment of Maynooth and the Disestablishment of the Irish Church, the question of National Education and the Ritualistic Question in all the various phases and aspects which these questions have assumed, the promulgation at Rome of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception and of Papal Infallibility, these and such as these are the subjects with which the Bishop deals during his long Episcopate of thirty-four years.

The whole of that period was a period marked by intense religious excitement—an excitement which cannot yet be said to have subsided. Whatever we may think of the controversies of those years, one thing is certain, that they have very largely influenced the present condition and future prospects of the Church of England. No doubt they were disfigured by a great deal of fiery partisanship and hasty assertion. No doubt there was exhibited in them a curious mixture of learning and extravagance, of piety and folly. But they have left their mark on the Church for good or for evil. The earnestness of the combatants lent a dignity to the struggle which might have otherwise seemed at times trivial and even puerile; and if some of these controversies have ceased to interest us except so far as they are a matter of history, others still occupy a large share of public attention. Politicians and legislators are still busy with the problem of National Education. The relations of the Church to Nonconformity are still very far from adjusted: every one feels the intricacy and delicacy of the questions involved. The disestablishment of the Irish Church is not so entirely a thing of the past, that it is quite superfluous to ask whether the Church of England is worth preserving; nor are the follies and extravagances of Ritualism less flagrant or less mischievous than they were, or ecclesiastical prosecutions likely to be less vexatious. We are not yet in smooth waters. The first angry roar of the storm may have died away, but the waves are still heaving with tumultuous agitation, and the clouds are heavy and may gather again. It is melancholy to reflect that amid such tempests we

have lost so wise a pilot; but he has left us in these Charges many admirable maxims, a chart which those may always consult with advantage whose lot it is to steer the bark of the Church. Let me indicate very briefly what appear to me to be some of their characteristic excellences, what it is that renders them, as it has been truly said, "the most faithful as well as impressive record" of the time to which they belong.

In the first place, their value consists to a great extent in the depth as well as the breadth of view which they everywhere exhibit. The Bishop is not satisfied with noting and discussing the phenomena: he goes to the root of the principles which underlie them. It is not merely the manifestation or the tendency which interests him; it is the source whence these have sprung. Hence he often detects the substantial agreement beneath the seeming divergence; hence he can apply the wise counsels of a healing moderation instead of exasperating animosities which were already too fiercely kindled.

In the next place, the combination of exact scholarship with a vast range of varied learning gave a singular weight to any opinion which fell from him on questions of criticism and interpretation. Here he had no rival on the Episcopal Bench, perhaps none among English scholars. There might be those who were not inferior to him in a critical knowledge of the Old Testament or of the New; none perhaps were equally sure of their ground in both. There were those who surpassed him in minute acquaintance with patristic and mediæval literature; there were none who possessed in the same degree the critical skill which could dissect a text, with the learning which could illustrate it. His range was wide, but he knew its limits. He was no pretender to knowledge; and hence on questions where an acquaintance with scientific investigations seemed necessary to speak with authority, he speaks with a reserve and a caution which to many appeared disappointing. But this very reserve inspires confidence. We can trust a guide who resolutely keeps within the limits of his own knowledge.

Added to this massive erudition there was the logical faculty

in its highest development. Nothing is more admirable than the lucidity with which he states an argument, or the crushing force with which he exposes a fallacy, unless it be the grave irony which adorns the reasoning.

Lastly, the most conspicuous feature in these Charges is the perfect impartiality with which every question is weighed, the judicial severity with which every controversy is surveyed. The Bishop is never a partisan. There is no haste, no passion in these pages. There is the wisdom and the philosophic insight and the calm strength of the judge, who sees clearly the prejudices of the contending parties, who is aware how conviction itself may cloud the understanding, who can detect the unconscious self-deception, and the mere strife of words in each successive contest, but who is never carried away himself, never betrayed into heat or exaggeration, never forgets the judge in the advocate. It is not that he lacks strength of conviction himself. True, his convictions are not cut and trimmed to the fashion of a party, but they are expressed boldly enough when the occasion calls for their expression. Still he never takes a side; and having a large toleration for all parties within the Church, he resists any "straitening of the liberties of the clergy," reprobates with just severity "the confusion of error with moral delinquency," and lays it down as a principle which ought never to be departed from, that "to sustain a charge of unsound doctrine involving penal consequences, nothing ought to suffice but the most direct, unequivocal statements, asserting that which the Church denies, or denying that which she asserts."

It is impossible sometimes not to feel a regret that one whose contributions to literature and theology were so valuable did not contribute to them more largely. But at least we may derive consolation from the reflection that whatever may be the fortunes of the Church, or whatever changes may pass over the aspect of her controversies, the thoughtful student will find in these volumes the best principles for his guidance, and the best model of that large-hearted moderation, that wise impartiality, with which all questions should be discussed.

These volumes will, I hope, be very shortly followed by another containing some of the Essays which appeared originally in the *Philological Museum* and the *Transactions* of the Royal Society of Literature, together with Occasional Sermons, the Speeches of the Bishop on the Admission of Jews into Parliament, and on the Disestablishment of the Irish Church, and a few other Pamphlets and Miscellanies.

J. J. S. P.

CAMBRIDGE,
Nov. 11*th*, 1876

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

VOL. I.

PAGE

First Charge, 1842. The Church in the Diocese of St. David's—The Tractarian Controversy 1

Second Charge, 1845. The Rubric and the Celebration of Public Service.—The Grant for the College of Maynooth . . . 53

Third Charge, 1848. Dr. Newman on Development.—Prosecutions for Heresy.—National Education 99

Fourth Charge, 1851. The Church in the Diocese of St. David's.—The Case of Gorham *v.* the Bishop of Exeter 141

Fifth Charge, 1854. Convocation.—Church Rates.—Confirmation.—Wilberforce's Doctrine of the Eucharist 197

Sixth Charge, 1857. The Dogma of the Immaculate Conception.—Eucharistic Controversy in the Church of England.—Rev. R. Williams' "Rational Godliness" 251

Seventh Charge, 1860. Church Rates.—Endowed Schools Bill.—Revision of the Liturgy 347

I.

A CHARGE

DELIVERED OCTOBER, 1842.

THE CHURCH IN THE DIOCESE OF ST. DAVID'S—THE TRACTARIAN CONTROVERSY.

MY REVEREND BRETHREN,

IF the object of our present meeting were to interchange assurances of mutual respect and goodwill, or to transact any ordinary business connected with the duties of our calling, I might have thought it requisite to explain why I suffered the earliest opportunity of holding it to pass by. But when I reflect, that I am now addressing you for the first time on this occasion, and consider the various important topics on which you may expect to hear my opinion and advice, I feel persuaded that you will not deem any apology needful for the delay, or be surprised that I was desirous of gathering fuller information on the state of the Diocese, than I could have brought to our conference, if it had taken place last year. The circuit which I then made, for a different purpose, was not, I trust, unprofitable with regard to this. Indeed, I am conscious that my knowledge of the condition of the Diocese is still imperfect, and consequently that I may be led to some erroneous conclusions on points which depend mainly on the results of experience and observation: though I trust that these mistakes will not be of serious moment, and that they will give occasion to their own correction. There would, no doubt, have been sufficient ground for such an apprehension in

any other new and large field of pastoral superintendence. But there are—as we are all aware—circumstances peculiar to this Diocese, or common to it with only a few beside, which claim especial attention, both on account of their great importance, and because it is more particularly with regard to them that there is most room for difference of opinion, and the greatest difficulty in forming a just estimate of their character, and a satisfactory decision as to the best mode of dealing with them. It may however be an advantage to us, that these circumstances will be apt to strike one to whom they are new, more forcibly than those to whom they have been long familiar, while there is, I trust, no danger lest the impression of novelty should be attended with any bias to distort the judgement.

Condition of the Diocese.

The occasion on which we are assembled, while it invites us to consider the present state of that portion of our Church which is the scene of our labours, naturally leads us to take a glance at the past, which contains the germs and causes of all that we have immediately before our eyes: as it is only by the light which the past and the present reflect on each other that we can hope to form a probable surmise as to the future. There is indeed much in this retrospect, as well as in the survey of what we now behold, to excite deep regret: scarcely anything that can yield unmixed satisfaction: but it would be unmanly and unwise to shrink from it on that account. It may be for that very reason the more instructive: and it is absolutely necessary that we should learn to contemplate it steadily and calmly, if we would not deceive ourselves as to our real position, our true interests, and our right course.

The prevalence of Nonconformity.

You will not suppose that it is my intention to enter into a historical inquiry which would open many disputed questions; I wish simply to direct your attention to a few notorious facts. The foremost among them is this: that, within a century past, a large part of the population of this Diocese has been alienated from our communion, and is still in a state of separation from it. It would, I repeat, be foolish and dastardly to turn our eyes away from this fact, or to treat it as a

secret which it is possible to conceal, or dangerous to divulge. It is highly desirable that we should look it in the face, and examine it in all its bearings. Various speculations have been formed to account for this result, which it would be foreign to our present business to notice. I would only remark, that whatever opinion we may adopt on this subject, we shall be in the greatest danger of falling into error, and of losing almost all the benefit to be derived from the lessons of history, if we either attempt to refer the fact to any single cause, or to explain it so as to shift all blame from the Church herself—considered in her successive members—on those who have abandoned her. Let it be our endeavour to bring an open mind, and an impartial spirit, to the consideration of the fact, which we cannot but view with deep concern. But let us be more especially on our guard against those prejudices into which we may be most easily betrayed, not only by our personal or professional interests, but even by our best and purest feelings. Let us not shrink from acknowledging, that the state of things which we deplore has arisen in a great measure out of neglect and abuses which we must not attempt to disguise or palliate, and may be properly regarded as a penalty which the Church has to pay for the selfishness, the supineness, and worldly spirit, with which her affairs were conducted, and her duties discharged, by those to whom they were entrusted. Let us not refuse to go still farther than this, and to make a confession which may appear to some of us much more humiliating. Let us not scruple to own, that much good has been done by those who are opposed to us: that the change which has been effected, within the period we are reviewing, in the moral and religious condition of the population, has been in many respects salutary; and that it has been produced by those very efforts from which the interests of our Church have so deeply suffered. This is an admission which we ought to make, so far as truth requires it, not only without reluctance, but with joy and thankfulness, though we must be humbled by the reflection, that this could not have been the case, had not the Church been in some great degree unfaithful to her

In what way it is to be accounted for.

It has been productive of good.

trust. And let us not desire to throw all the blame on those who have gone before us, and to claim an entire freedom from like transgressions and omissions for ourselves.

Evils in the Church at large.

But on the other hand, let us not, in a spirit of false liberality, aggravate those features of the case which we might naturally most wish to soften, nor dwell exclusively on those facts which are most painful to our feelings, as Churchmen. Let us remember that the lukewarmness and inertness, the recklessness and worldly-mindedness, with which in the early part of the last century the resources of the Church were so often misapplied, and her duties neglected—that this character was not at that time confined to this, or to any part of the body, but prevailed throughout the whole; and not only so, but that if we look abroad beyond our own communion, we shall find that during the same period no other was in a more flourishing state: that almost all were languishing under similar or more grievous disorders. And while we trace the consequences of these common faults and errors, let us not overlook the peculiar causes of weakness, the difficulties and disadvantages under which this portion of our Church has laboured, and with which it has still to struggle; the inadequate maintenance which it affords to so many of her ministers, which prevents them from devoting each his whole time and attention to one parish; the deficiency in church-room, which excludes so large a part of the population from her public worship, and compels them to seek religious instruction elsewhere; the condition of so many of her sacred edifices, some sinking into irreparable decay, many more in such a state as to repel any one who was not willing to make a sacrifice of personal comfort, if not of health, to devotion: to all which must be added, in many districts, the necessity of providing for the spiritual wants of a population divided by a difference of language, which prevents the two sections from joining in one religious service. And there is another feature in the case, which ought not to pass unnoticed, both for the sake of justice to the Church, and because it may suggest some useful lessons. It is evident that

Evils peculiar to the Diocese.

the progress of Dissent has not been in proportion to the growth of any of the evils, the faults and abuses, to which its origin is commonly referred. On the contrary, it might seem as if it had been stimulated by the reviving zeal and energy which have been displayed in the Church; and which, if they had been called forth earlier and more generally, would probably have been sufficient to counteract it. We cannot help concluding that the breach has been widened by the operation of motives and principles foreign to those of its authors. The leaders who reluctantly seceded, and drew others away from the Church, because they could not find within her pale a sufficient supply for their spiritual wants, but never ceased to regard themselves as members of her communion, were followed by others, who have made it their main object to render the separation as complete, formal, and lasting as possible, and have exhibited, and propagated, a spirit of decided hostility toward her. We cannot but look on this as a proof, that the work which was begun in many cases with pure intentions, though perhaps with a great want of moderation and prudence, has been since directed and forwarded by an agency in which we may reasonably suspect a strong admixture of human passions. For we find traces of this hostile spirit as well where the difference of doctrine is apparently slightest, as where it includes points of the greatest moment. The fact presents an instructive illustration of the universal tendency of schism, to which we may well apply what the wise man says generally of *strife*, that its *beginning is as when one letteth out water*. And it holds out a warning, which will not be slighted by those who value the unity of the Church, against every arbitrary, wilful infringment of any rules or observances calculated to secure it. We see, and feel, how much easier it is to break down than to restore, to sever than to re-unite, to scatter than to gather again: how much easier to perceive occasional inconveniences, which may under particular circumstances be produced by a wholesome restraint, than to foresee the disastrous consequences which may result from a breach of the law, or disregard of the authority which imposes it. We learn how essential patience, caution, and

The changed aspect of Dissent.

Its hostility to the Church.

humility are to the exercise of charity, and that it is only by them the reality can be distinguished from its counterfeit.

Indications of an improvement in the Church.

It would have been a much more pleasing part of my duty, if it had been in my power to congratulate you on a favourable change in the state of things we have been considering, or to direct your attention to any clear indication of the approach of better times for this portion of the Church. I do not say that such indications are not here and there perceptible; but they are neither so uniform, nor so numerous, as to make it safe to dwell upon them as grounds of confidence: though we may very properly derive encouragement, as well as instruction, from any cases, however few or obscure, in which success has attended efforts which we are able to imitate. But, independent of such partial advantages, there are some general sources of consolation, and grounds of hope, which it will be both cheering and profitable to keep in view. I would remind you, that even those among you who are placed in circumstances where the actual difficulties of the Church are greatest, and her prospects appear most gloomy, may derive comfort from an assurance like that with which the Prophet animated his desponding servant: nor will it require any extraordinary revelation to satisfy them that they need not fear, however lonely and perilous their position may seem; for in many senses we may say, with regard to our adversaries, that *they which be with us are more than they which be with them.* This is true, not only with respect to such associates and auxiliaries as are only to be discerned by the eye of faith, in past ages and distant spheres, but with respect to the present state of the Church, if we will only enlarge our view, to comprehend it as a whole, and do not let any local obstacles obstruct our survey, and if we widen our sympathy to embrace all who are partakers with us in the same doctrine and fellowship. We shall then undoubtedly find, in the fortunes of the entire body, ample matter for joy and hope, numberless signs of growing strength, of prosperous activity, of a spirit tending at the same time to consolidate her foundations, to supply her defects, and to enlarge her borders; and so, both within and without, to assert

her true character, and to vindicate her claims to the affection and reverence of her children. While we consider what has been effected and is going on elsewhere, we might easily forget the less agreeable objects presented to our view in our immediate neighbourhood; but it would not be right to do so: much rather ought we to dwell upon the contrast, and let it stimulate and encourage us to redoubled exertions.

It is also consoling to reflect, and this reflection is suggested and confirmed by that which we have just made, that the losses which the Church has sustained among us, have not arisen from any inherent, irremediable defect in her system, from any unsoundness in her principles, or weakness in her constitution, or from any cause which ought to abate the attachment of her friends. It may be a question, whether they are chargeable in a greater degree on the faults and errors of her members and ministers, or on outward events which it was still less in her power to prevent or control: but on either supposition we may trust that they will be repaired, in proportion as her means are enlarged, the obstacles which have checked her expansion removed, and her capacities more fully brought out into action. And happily this is no mere possibility or devout aspiration, but a prospect which we have actually before us, and which only requires time to become a present reality. Among the outward conditions most indispensably necessary for the accomplishment of her objects, the two which stand foremost, are undoubtedly a ministry, and places of worship, in sufficient number, and convenient situations, for supplying the wants of the people. I need scarcely observe, that there is at present a very great deficiency in both respects in this Diocese. Few parishes possess the advantage of a resident minister, who is able to devote his time exclusively to one. In the great majority of cases, the poverty of the endowment has rendered it necessary to commit two parishes to the care of the same person, to whom they commonly afford a barely adequate maintenance. It follows, of course, that either on the morning or evening one of the churches remains closed every Sunday, and

The evils not inherent in the system of the Church.

Deficiency of Clergy and Churches.

those who are unwilling to neglect public worship must seek it elsewhere. Yet even this is perhaps a slighter evil than that which arises where the extent of a parish prevents a portion of its inhabitants, sometimes the largest portion, though well inclined, from resorting to the church for Divine Service at all. We cannot wonder that districts should be lost to the Church, we can scarcely regret that they should be occupied by her adversaries, where, but for a few occasional visits of the minister, who must be almost a stranger, seldom seen, and still more rarely sent for, there is nothing to remind the people of her existence. A third case, of very frequent occurrence, is that in which the difference of language in one parish renders it impossible for all members of the Church to join in her worship at the same time; and consequently either one part must be wholly neglected, or both imperfectly provided for. I have intimated that there is room to hope that these wants will be gradually supplied. It must indeed, as every one is aware who knows the extent of the deficiency, be a work of time: but still it is consoling and encouraging to have a prospect of improvement before us, however slow, if steady and certain.

The bilingual difficulty.

And such we have in the aid which we may look for in more quarters than one. We naturally turn our thoughts, in the first place, toward the fund placed at the disposal of the Ecclesiastical Commission: and perhaps there is no part of the kingdom where the appropriation of ecclesiastical property to the purposes of that fund might seem to be more urgently demanded by the interests of the Church, than this Diocese. But the benefit which it is entitled to expect from the measure will not be immediately in proportion to the amount of its contributions to the common fund. The resolutions of the Commissioners, which give a just preference to the claims of the largest destitute masses of population, will operate to postpone those of a Diocese in which the population is spread over a large surface. In the meanwhile, however, those districts out of which the revenues composing the funds issue, will experience such aid as their circumstances may require. But the relief of our most

Sources from which aid may be expected.

pressing want, that of ministers and places of worship in parts now almost destitute, must still depend on private liberality, and the assistance of the excellent societies which have been instituted for these purposes. And we have ground to hope that they will continue to call forth the pious munificence of the opulent friends of the Church; that their funds will be increased in proportion to the growing demands made upon them; and that the spirit in which they were founded, and have been supported elsewhere, will spread among the affluent members of the Church in this Diocese.

Repair of Churches. Legislative enactments.

Much as we must regret that legislative enactments should have been necessary to enforce, wherever it is practicable, the residence of the clergy among their flocks, we cannot but rejoice at the prospect, that the abuses which gave occasion to those enactments will, at no distant time, have disappeared. Some interposition of the Legislature would perhaps be still more desirable to put an end to the uncertainty which at present prevails as to the legal means of enforcing the obligation imposed by the law, of keeping churches in repair. A measure which, without a sacrifice of existing rights, should remove the occasions of discord afforded by the present state of the law on this subject, would be one of the greatest benefits the Church could receive from the Legislature. I pass lightly over these topics, and I am far from wishing to exaggerate the importance of the relief and assistance which may be expected from any of these channels. I do not think it would be at all desirable, that we should conceal from ourselves, that it is either precarious in its nature, or will be narrowly limited in amount, and is possibly reserved for a distant period. If it is fit that we should not overlook any part of our brighter prospects, that we should note all those signs which prove that the resources of the Church are not exhausted, and that we are not labouring without means, or against hope, it is still more important that we should never forget that, under the Divine blessing, it is on the spirit that prevails in the Church itself that all our hopes must ultimately depend. Whatever contributions may be made to the work, are chiefly valuable as indications of

More to be hoped from the Church herself.

the interest taken in it; and they will be only useful, in proportion as they shall be applied in a like spirit of devotedness and self-denial. Without the willing and zealous co-operation of the laity, the exertions of the clergy, however strenuous, can never be attended with more than a very scanty measure of ambiguous success. It was under a deep conviction of this truth, that, at the meeting of Rural Deans held this summer, I proposed to revive, with such modifications as the change of circumstances appeared to require, the Diocesan Association instituted by Bishop Burgess, under the name of "The Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge and Church Union, in the Diocese of St. David's," which having accomplished one of its most important objects, in the establishment of the College at Lampeter, had for several years ceased to exercise any of its functions, and might be considered as extinct. The unanimity with which the proposal to revive it, under the name of *The Church Union Society*, was adopted by the meeting, encourages me to hope that the measure will be attended with happy results. As the Resolutions then agreed to, which describe the objects of the revived Association, will soon be placed in your hands, I need not occupy your time on this occasion with a more explicit statement of those objects. I trust that the more generally they become known, the more they will engage the sympathy and aid of the friends of the Church throughout the Diocese. For the present I will only express my earnest hope, that you will both yourselves support the Association to the utmost of your ability, and endeavour to obtain the co-operation of the laity in your respective neighbourhoods. But we must remember, that such a co-operation on the part of the laity will always be regulated by the degree of zeal and energy displayed by the clergy, by the sense which they appear to entertain of the importance of their own duties, and the faithfulness with which they discharge them. This, which is true at all times, is most emphatically true at the present juncture. The interests of the Church entrusted to her ministers at a critical period, are of more than ordinary magnitude. More may be sacrificed by neglect or

Diocesan Church Union Society.

Co-operation of laity and Clergy.

imprudence, more may be won, both for this and future generations, by vigilance and activity, than in times of less promise and less danger, when it is sufficient to hand down the deposit unimpaired. On us, in our measure, it depends, whether the Church shall realize her brighter prospects, and be able to profit by the succour she may receive. But as such opportunities, when neglected, are not to be expected soon to return, unless we leave her in a better condition than we found her in, it is certain that we shall leave her in one much worse, and less hopeful, and that we shall be answerable for the loss and damage her cause will have sustained. And therefore, it is to myself a source of the greatest satisfaction to believe, that there prevails among the clergy of this Diocese a degree of zeal and activity, not inferior to that which is to be found in any other, or in any past period; and certainly in no other is it put to the test by greater difficulties and discouragements. The more praiseworthy and valuable it is on this account, the more desirable is it that it should be employed to the utmost advantage, and that it should be so enlightened and regulated by right principles and maxims, as not unconsciously to take a direction in which it would defeat its own objects. I am inclined to think that in both these respects there is room for suggestions and warnings, some of which may be now peculiarly seasonable.

Importance of concert and co-operation among the Clergy.

There is, I am persuaded, no one among us, who does not feel that there is need, not only of all that each can do by himself in behalf of the Church, but of concert and co-operation among those who are labouring in the same cause; no one who thinks so highly of himself, as not to believe that he may learn much, and derive much assistance from communication with his brethren, nor so engrossed with his own share of the common work, as not to be desirous of imparting to others whatever has been recommended by his own experience to himself. We are throwing away the most important of our privileges, if we never, or rarely and but for very few purposes, avail ourselves of our communion with one another: if each remains almost entirely a stranger to the manner in which his brethren discharge their duties, without the means of profiting by their knowledge and

experience, and without an opportunity of rendering any like service to them. It is not enough that we are members of one great body, unless we feel ourselves to be so, and realize the unity which we profess by mutual sympathy and succour. One of the advantages resulting from such conferences as the present, consists in the strengthening of this consciousness of fellowship, and in the opportunity it affords of interchanging information and opinions. But these occasions occur far too rarely to answer the desired end, and in this Diocese archidiaconal meetings do not fill up the void. The place of the Archdeacon is for many purposes supplied by the Rural Dean, the revival of whose office was a great benefit conferred on this Diocese, and, in the way of an example which has been extensively followed, on the Church at large. But useful and indispensable as it has proved, it cannot be said that it has hitherto been brought out in its full efficiency here, as it has in other Dioceses where it was revived at a much later period. One of the objects which it answers, is to convey information to the Bishop. Even this will be more fully accomplished, when the visitations of the Rural Deans shall be performed more regularly, and a report of everything worthy of remark be periodically transmitted to the Bishop; and this I have the pleasure to know, from the assurances I received at the general meeting of the Rural Deans held this summer, will henceforward be carried into effect. But another important branch of their office is, to serve as centres of union for the clergy of the Deaneries: and this has either never been attempted, or has generally failed. I am convinced that great benefit would be likely to arise from meetings of the clergy, held periodically in each Deanery under the presidency of the Rural Dean, for the purpose of communication on all subjects connected with the general and local interests of the Church. In these conferences doubts might be removed, and information and advice interchanged, on whatever points, either of doctrine or practice, might occur in the course of your parochial ministrations. And with these meetings there might be advantageously connected the formation of libraries and

Office of Rural Dean.

Rural-decanal conferences.

reading societies, which might supply the want of theological works, and particularly of the more important in modern literature, which is often so painfully felt by clergymen in retired situations with limited incomes. It would not be unreasonable to expect, among other fruits of such an institution, that it might contribute a number of useful additions to the popular works designed for the instruction of the poor. It is only through the press that a great part of our population is accessible to any teaching but what they receive from Separatists. Plain, pithy, pointed, and lucid statements, exhibiting the real doctrines of the Church on disputed points, and removing the many popular prejudices and errors which prevail both as to the nature and the grounds of her distinguishing tenets, with as little as possible of polemical discussion, in language and style adapted to the most numerous class of readers, might be of incalculable service. But it is peculiarly desirable that works of this description should be previously subjected to the revision of a competent board, to prevent the harm which would result to the cause from imperfect or exaggerated statements, or unsound arguments, into which the advocate of truth may often be unconsciously betrayed. There is undoubtedly at present a scarcity of such publications, especially in the native language of the great mass of the people, which might be supplied by translations from approved English works of the kind I have adverted to: and even though they should not be now on the list of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, I think there is ground to hope, that the Society might be induced, either to enlarge its list, or to relax its rules, for the sake of furthering an object so strictly in accordance with its own.

Libraries and reading societies.

I am aware that what I have here recommended is nothing new. But it is to be regretted that for some years past, meetings such as I have described, have been generally superseded by others of a very different description. The accounts which I have received lead me to believe that the clerical meetings, which are now very frequently held throughout the Diocese, have little more in common with such conferences than the name: that they are merely occasions on which a number of

Existing Clerical Meetings in the Diocese.

clergymen attend Divine Service, and the greater part of the time is occupied with public discourses addressed to the congregation. It does not appear, that a private conference of the assembled clergy is any regular or usual part of the proceedings. The causes which gave rise to this innovation are not obscure; the motives were, and are, I have no doubt, most praiseworthy; the effect, it may be hoped, on the whole, salutary; but still I must be allowed to express my regret, that in any instance the meetings of the clergy should have assumed this form. Where this is the case, it appears to me that the higher and far more important object has been sacrificed to one comparatively of little value. No doubt the ultimate end which those who attend such meetings should propose to themselves, is the edification of their flocks. But the people is in fact deprived of the chief benefits which it might derive from the consultations of its pastors, if the only result is the delivery of a few public discourses: while the opportunity is lost for such an interchange of experience and observation, as would assist each in the performance of his ordinary ministerial duties. I do not mean that it may not be very desirable to make use of such occasions for the instruction of the people by means of addresses from the pulpit: especially if the subjects selected be of such a nature as to convey seasonable information, not usually found in parochial sermons. But it must be considered that the benefit produced in this way is at best of a very limited and fugitive kind, and not unmixt with very serious danger, both to the people and the ministers. There is danger to the congregation, lest they should mistake the gratification of an indolent curiosity for spiritual edification, and should be led to form an extravagant estimate of the value of one part of the service: and there is danger to the ministers, lest they should be drawn into display and competition with their brethren; which can hardly fail to be sometimes the case, when more than one discourse is delivered during the same service. Even where this most pernicious effect is not produced, it will be scarcely possible, in meetings so conducted, to avoid the appearance of it, which will make an impression on the hearers very unfavourable to their

Evils of the existing practice.

spiritual edification, and not at all calculated to heighten their respect for the Church or her ministers. I have observed that it is not difficult to account for the origin of this practice; but I must own, that it does not appear to me to be recommended by this consideration. It belongs to a system which is not that of the Church, and which it is neither honourable nor prudent to imitate. It was a state of things so far similar to our own, as to hold out what may still be in some respects a useful warning to ourselves, that drew the following observations from one of our old Divines :—"As to sermons, I hope they do not undertake to be as eminent a part of the worship of God among us as prayer. If they do, I must the less blame the poor ignorant people, that, when they have heard a sermon or two, think that they have served God for all that day or week; nor the generality of those seduced ones, who place so great a part of piety in hearing, and think so much the more comfortably of themselves from the number of the hours spent in that exercise, which hath of late been the only business of the Church (which was by God entitled the House of Prayer) and the Liturgy at most used but as music to entertain the auditors, till the actors be attired, and the seats be full, and it be time for the scene to enter." *

It has been borrowed from Dissent.

But the remark which I made as to the origin of this practice admits of a more general application, and seems to me so important, that I am desirous of drawing your attention expressly to it, and of illustrating it by some other examples. Let me premise, that I can enter very fully into the feelings which may induce a minister, anxious for the welfare of his people, and the prosperity of the Church, but surrounded by Separatists, whom he sees continually increasing their numbers, to resort to extraordinary expedients for the purpose of retaining or recovering a congregation. It is neither strange nor blamable, that he should be willing to try all allowable means of attracting hearers, and, if the mass of the people should be deeply imbued

Danger of a neglect of Church principles.

* Hammond: "View of the New Directory." Works, Vol. I. p. 167 (ed. 1674). Compare Hooker, E. P. V. 81. (Vol. II. p. 524, ed. Keble.) Some excellent remarks on this subject may be found in Mr. Evans's "Bishopric of Souls," p. 102: a work which cannot be too strongly recommended to every clergyman's study.

with sectarian prejudices, that he should be inclined to every degree of accommodation to their tastes and opinions, not manifestly inconsistent with his character and engagements as a minister of the Church. But let me remind you that, laudable as is the motive which prompts such attempts at conciliation, they may be carried too far, so as to injure the cause which they are designed to promote. The Church cannot be permanently a gainer—she must ultimately lose—by an addition to her professed members, purchased at the expence of her principles, or of her legitimate authority. In such cases those whom she seems to have won, do not in fact belong to her: they are strangers at heart, and always ready, when the temporary attraction is withdrawn, to abandon her communion again. Thus, where a prejudice—I fear not an uncommon one—prevails against the use of a Liturgy, or a disposition to consider the sermon as the most important part of the service, a clergyman, particularly a young one, may easily be tempted to humour this prejudice by arbitrary curtailment, or rapid reading, or by the introduction of extemporaneous prayers. In each of these ways he is tacitly casting a slur upon the Church, and sanctioning one of the principles most opposed to her doctrine and spirit. Another mode of compromise, which is not less objectionable, is the holding of meetings on a Sunday out of the church, for purposes to which the Church Service is destined, without making use of it. There are, I fear, not a few cases in which a Lecture in a school-room, or some other common building, is substituted for the Church Service, while the church remains closed. Such a practice appears to me equivalent to an admission, that our form of prayer is really a bar, not a help, to devotion, and may be advantageously superseded by the minister's occasional effusions. I cannot distinguish such meetings from conventicles: the presence and presidency of the Clergyman only renders the implied admission the more glaring and pernicious. It is a breach of faith to the Church, as well as a violation of an express engagement. The same remark applies to every departure from the Rubric, grounded on no

The Liturgy.

The Church.

The Rubric.

other motive than deference to the taste and prejudices of a part of the congregation. Other and perhaps still graver objections apply to a practice derived from the same source, according to which meetings are, I believe, frequently held for the purpose of prayer, not common, according to the forms of the Church, nor offered by the minister alone, but by as many of the persons present as choose to join in it. I would not seek to impose a restraint on any spontaneous exercise of private devotion: but in meetings so numerous and open, that they cannot properly be called private, it is not only to be regretted that the place and form which the Church has provided should be thus neglected, but there is too much reason to fear, that the spirit of display and curiosity will be constantly apt to quench that of true devotion: and the persons who have been accustomed to take a leading part in these exercises, will not only be likely to feel but little interest in the ordinary service of the Church, but will be easily tempted to come forward on other occasions still more prominently, as teachers, and thus in both ways to supersede the office of the appointed Pastor. In fact, as our Church exercises her office of Teacher, no less by her forms of prayer, than by her Catechism, Articles, Homilies, and other doctrinal formularies, so persons thus praying in public are in fact assuming the same office. That they should be allowed to do so by a minister of the Church, in his presence, seems to me a virtual abdication of his charge, a direct encouragement to schism.

Pastoral ministrations out of the Church.

It is often difficult for a minister to draw the line between his private and public ministrations. The private visit, if it attracts the attendance of a numerous company, will acquire the character of a public meeting, for worship and instruction, for which the Church has provided certain forms, and for which there is in every parish an appropriate public place. But there may be circumstances, in which he has, on such occasions, opportunities of addressing many whom he could not at that time collect for the daily service, or perhaps be ever likely to see in the church at all; and of addressing them in a manner better suited to their

peculiar wants and habits, more likely to reach their understandings, and to affect their consciences, than he could properly adopt in his public ministry. Such opportunities, no doubt, ought not to be neglected. But on the other hand it will be proper to remember, that such exercises, however useful in themselves, do not answer the purpose of that visitation of the sick, in which it is a main part of the Pastor's duty to inquire into the sick person's condition, and to adapt his discourse to the answers he may receive; an object, for which greater privacy seems generally desirable. It is also necessary to be cautious, that these meetings do not by degrees assume a different character, and become occasions of schism. The best effect which can result from them, and which a zealous and judicious minister will keep steadily in view, would be that they should lead to the foundation of a weekly Lecture in the church.

The order of the Church to be followed in public teaching.

I would add, that there may be omissions, proceeding from the same motive, which may do no less wrong to the Church, than the deviations from her Rubric, which I have been noticing. In her Prayer Book she has so provided for the public instruction of her children, that the leading doctrines and facts of our religion are constantly, in regular succession, brought before their minds in the course of the daily Service. But the practical application of this principle is left to depend very much on the minister, who in his discourses may either observe or neglect this order; and, more especially in places where the sermon occupies perhaps an undue share of attention, unless, by his choice of subjects, he seconds the intention of the Church, it will be very imperfectly realised by the greater part of the congregation. The omission of topics naturally suggested by the season, will probably be interpreted, either as a tacit acknowledgement that they were not of sufficient importance to justify the Church in her commemoration of them, or that such a distinction of times is itself indefensible. The more reason there may be to apprehend that such opinions are entertained by a large part of the hearers, the more desirable it is that every such opportunity

should be diligently employed, both to explain and defend, and practically to illustrate and recommend the ordinances of the Church.

In general, more benefit may be expected from an assiduous use of the means which the Church prescribes, than from any extraordinary methods, foreign to her system, and borrowed from her adversaries, though these may appear more promising, and may for a time be actually more successful in attracting hearers. It must be remembered, that this kind of success is always of an ambiguous nature, and at the best is only desirable as a means, not as the end, which is not merely to gather large congregations, but to form a people really attached to the Church, and giving her a decided and intelligent preference. It is so far from being all in all, that it would be hurtful to her interests, if it involved a sacrifice of her principles, or was obtained by expedients which cherished a spirit opposed to her's. It may often require a difficult exercise of patience, and courage, and faith, to abstain from such seemingly innocent compliances with tastes and prejudices, the existence of which we regret: but it is a case in which we may find room to apply the prophet's exhortation, (Is. xxx. 15,) "In quietness and in confidence shall be your strength." Often the most zealous must be content with sowing the seed, without even a hope that they shall be permitted to gather or see the harvest. And in fact, their most useful and important labours must be of this kind. At least, they cannot expect to reap at once, or very soon, the fruits of that which they spend on the education of the young: and yet this is in all cases a main part of their duty; and where we have least reason to be satisfied with the actual condition of the Church, it is to this that we must look almost exclusively for the improvement of her prospects.

The education of the poor.

Much I believe remains to be done in every part of the Diocese for the education of the poor. At the same time, I am persuaded that the defect has not arisen from any want of zeal and activity on the part of the Clergy. I have no reason to doubt that they are generally impressed with a conviction of the vast importance of the subject, and that

they have shewn themselves ready to exert their utmost endeavours, and to make great personal sacrifices, to promote the cause of education. But I fear there are still but too many cases, in which their efforts have failed, either because they have not been sufficiently seconded by the good will of the opulent laity, or because they have been obstructed by local difficulties, which they have hitherto been unable to overcome, in their attempts to provide for the support of a teacher, or the erection of a schoolroom. And this appears to be most frequently the case, in places where the poverty of the labourers renders them unable, or at least, unwilling, to contribute, even the smallest amount, toward the expence of instruction for their children. It seems to be but very rarely that the temporary sojourn of the Circulating Schools —to which nevertheless it must be owned the country has been deeply indebted—has been followed by the permanent establishment of others. Still I have the satisfaction to believe, that the number of cases in which there is a total deficiency of means of instruction for the children of the poor, is rapidly decreasing, and I venture to hope, that the time is not distant, when this want shall be every where in some degree supplied. But all the information I have been able to collect on the state of education in the Diocese, leads me to think, that in most places where it is afforded, it stands in great need of improvement. It appears to me that sufficient attention has not been paid to the qualifications of the teachers. I am aware indeed that the scantiness of the remuneration allotted to them may often render it impossible to insist upon all the conditions which are known to be desirable. But still I believe that it would not be difficult to raise the present ordinary standard, and to exact from the persons employed such an amount of skill and information, as will enable them to impart something more than those first rudiments, which are not so properly knowledge, as the instruments by which the child is enabled to acquire it. It would of course be highly desirable, that every teacher should be qualified, not only to teach the letters, but to explain the sense, of the books used in the school, that he should be able to communicate the first elements of vocal music, and that he

Circulating Schools.

should be practically familiar with the most improved methods of instruction that have been adopted in the best schools of the same kind. And I am persuaded that these qualifications would soon become much more common, if an opportunity was afforded to persons who wished to prepare themselves for the office of teacher, of seeing a school conducted according to the best system, by one who possessed these advantages, and which would thus at the same time answer the purpose of a model and a training school.

Importance of vocal music in education.

You will not, I am sure, think that I attach an exaggerated importance to vocal music as a part of popular education, because I have mentioned an acquaintance with it among what I should wish to see considered as the indispensable qualifications of a schoolmaster for the poor. Your experience will undoubtedly have convinced you, that the value of this attainment can hardly be estimated too highly, with a view to its moral and religious uses. You know better than I could explain, the great benefit which might be expected to result to the performance of public worship, both as to the degree in which it would realise the intentions of our Church, and the influence it would exercise over the people, if this knowledge and skill were more generally diffused among the lower classes, and perhaps I may add, that the natural taste and habits of the indigenous population seem to offer peculiar facilities for its diffusion. But there is another point, perhaps still more intimately connected with their welfare, and with the prospects of the Church, which does not seem to be always considered in the right point of view by those who have the superintendence of schools for the poor, and therefore deserves a few remarks in this place. An opinion seems to have prevailed, that it is useless, or even inexpedient, where English is not the mother tongue of the people, to teach them to read their own language. I am convinced that this maxim is quite erroneous, and attended with many practical consequences, injurious both to the people and to the Church. I believe the ordinary effect to be, that they acquire but a very imperfect command over either language: that which they habitually speak gives them no access to books, and

Instruction of Welsh children in their own language.

the books which they are able to read are seldom intelligible to them without more application than they have often time to bestow on any intellectual labour. They consequently remain destitute of that information which they might have derived with ease and pleasure from works written in their own language: they can join but imperfectly in the public Service of the Church, and are therefore the more easily persuaded to forsake it, while the Church has no means of reaching them through the press, and is compelled to abandon them, without a struggle, to all the errors and prejudices they may imbibe, when they are withdrawn from the oral instruction of her ministers. It seems therefore highly desirable, that in all such cases both languages should be taught together, and there can be little doubt that this practice would be attended with a more rapid progress in each.

But though it may be reasonably hoped, that by such means a very considerable improvement may be effected in popular education among us, I am perfectly aware, that there are causes which render it necessary, if we would spare ourselves the pain of disappointment, to confine our expectations within limits far short of our wishes. The results which we may look for from the most successful application of the most approved system, under the most zealous and able management, must still depend on circumstances over which we have no controul, and which will, it is to be feared, in most cases, tend to reduce the amount of good which can be accomplished by our utmost exertions. The early age at which the parents find or think it necessary to take their children away from school, that they may begin to contribute by their labour to the support of the family, will often put a stop to the work of education before it has passed far beyond the simplest elements of instruction. It will be for each of you to use all your influence to prevent any needless sacrifice of the highest interests of the rising generation to selfish calculations of petty immediate advantage: to consider how far the establishment of evening schools may remedy the evil where it cannot be prevented, and to see that the time allowed for the purpose of education be turned by judicious economy to the best account. You will, I am sure, be

fully sensible, that the stock of general knowledge to be acquired by the children of the poor, is a point of secondary importance: that the main object is the formation of habits and principles which will affect their character and conduct through life. Permit me however to observe, that however prematurely the child's school-education may be brought to a close, there can be no absolute necessity that your intercourse with him should terminate at the same time. He may still be within the reach of your weekly catechetical instruction: and it is on this account peculiarly important that this branch of your pastoral duties should be diligently administered, and in a manner calculated both to instruct and edify, and to interest the youthful mind. And it is probably never more likely to answer these ends, and at the same time to strengthen the attachment of those of riper years to the Church, than where such instruction is given, according to the intention of the Church, in the presence of the congregation. I am convinced that many of our churches would be much better attended, if this practice were revived. Where the religious instruction has been continued until the child becomes a candidate for Confirmation, the task of preparation for that important rite will cost you much less trouble and anxiety, while the prospect of benefit from it will be greatly improved. Where on the other hand that instruction has been for some years either wholly neglected or intermitted, the opportunity afforded by a confirmation for inculcating religious principles is doubly precious, as it may be the first and the last you have to expect. But in all cases, and in every point of view, it is of incalculable value, and deserves your most earnest attention. Since the advantages to be derived from the rite depend on the state of the candidate, and this again determined much less by his years, than by the preparation he has received, it may not be expedient to establish any inflexible regulation as to the age of admission: though, as a general rule, it may be desirable that none should be received before they have completed their fifteenth year. But in all cases it is most essential that the preparation should embrace a period of

Knowledge of less importance than the formation of habits.

Instruction with a view to Confirmation.

sufficient length to allow time for such examination as may satisfy the minister as to the real qualifications of the candidates, and for such instruction in the leading doctrines of their religion, as will enable them both clearly to understand the nature of the rite, and to receive a durable impression from it.

The controversy respecting the Oxford Tracts.

The subjects to which I have been hitherto directing your attention, appeared to me the most important with regard to the circumstances of the Church in this Diocese, and the time they have occupied has left but little to spare for any others. Yet I cannot but feel that I might not only be disappointing a natural and reasonable expectation, but neglecting a valuable opportunity, and that I might seem to be shrinking from the discharge of a duty, if I were to pass over some other questions, which deeply affect the general interests of the Church, and which have been for some years past, and still are, subjects of earnest controversy. This controversy, it is true, can scarcely be said to have found its way into this Diocese: here it has attracted comparatively little notice, and those of the Clergy who have paid any attention to it, have, I believe, for the most part, viewed it as from a distance, and with scarcely a livelier feeling than one of speculative curiosity: and this may look like a reason why it might have been better to abstain from adverting to it on this occasion. But I am not at liberty to suppose that views and opinions which are elsewhere exercising a powerful practical influence on a great part of the body to which we belong, can be a matter of indifference to any of us; nor does our present tranquillity afford any security, that they may not become an occasion of discord, which would weaken our hands and multiply our difficulties. But it does enable me to address you on the subject with somewhat less apprehension than I should otherwise have felt, of giving offence, while it seems to impose on me the duty of directing my remarks to points which have a bearing on our own peculiar circumstances. That you have been permitted to stand aloof, and have no inducement to take an active part in that controversy, and have thus been exempted from the passions and prejudices which it has excited elsewhere, and have been enabled to form an impartial judgment upon the

questions involved in it, this I consider as an advantage in your present position, which I trust you will not be eager to part with; and I hope I scarcely need to caution you against enlisting yourselves on either side, before you have made yourselves fully acquainted with the merits of the case. This forbearance, which is so clearly enjoined both by justice and prudence, will no doubt appear to you the more important, when you compare the great bulk of the literature which this controversy has produced, with your ordinary means and opportunities of studying it, and especially when you observe the learning, ability, zeal, and piety, which have been exhibited on both sides. You will be the more reluctant to exchange the attitude of spectators for that of partisans, where both the contending parties present so many claims to respect, and you will be the less ready to believe that either is in exclusive possession of the truth.

This controversy not a subject of unmixed regret.

However this may be, it will probably seem to many persons a calamity to be deeply deplored, that gifts and qualities such as I have just mentioned, which, if harmoniously employed, might have rendered the most important services to the Church, should have been arrayed in conflict against each other; and no doubt it would have been much more desirable that they should have been drawn forth, in an equal degree of activity, by combined exertions for the common cause. But I cannot on this account concur with those who would regard the controversy as a subject of unmixed regret, or who think that any evil has hitherto arisen from it, which has not been much more than counterbalanced by its beneficial effects. I just now alluded to the bulk of its literary productions: of those which may be considered as immediately and visibly representing it. But the mass of publications which though not—professedly at least—of a controversial nature, are intimately connected with it, and have not only taken their tone and colour from it, but could not have existed without it, is far greater, and I cannot but regard the whole, though including much that has no more than a fugitive or historical value, as a precious addition to our theological literature, such as might perhaps suffer little by comparison with

all that it had received in the course of a century before. And yet it is chiefly valuable and interesting as an expression or indication of the new life which has been recently awakened in the Church. Others may regret that public attention should have been so much turned this way, and diverted from the subjects which appear to them of supreme importance—from politics, or science, or political economy, or classical literature: but, speaking to you on this occasion, I can only treat it as a matter for mutual congratulation, that, through whatever cause, a spirit should have been roused, which has engaged so many active and powerful minds in the cultivation of theological learning. As Churchmen, we must rejoice, that the study of Divinity should have begun to embrace a wider range than, for a long period before, had satisfied the greater part of those who dedicated themselves to the ministry, that it should have become more generally conversant with Christian antiquity, with Ecclesiastical History, and with the original sources from which the knowledge of these subjects is derived; so that even ordinary students much less frequently confine their reading to a narrow circle of modern compilations, systems, outlines, and commentaries, and not only are used to carry their inquiries farther, but are more desirous of seeing and judging for themselves. All this indeed would be of little value, if the spirit which has been awakened had been one of merely literary curiosity, or intellectual energy. But every one who has observed its workings, must be aware that the case is very far otherwise; that it is bent, with a deep consciousness, and warm earnestness, upon high practical ends. It may even be doubted, whether there is not some danger, lest this practical tendency should be carried to excess, and lead to the neglect and discouragement of all critical inquiries into theological subjects, not obviously or immediately pointing to practical results. But it is more important, as well as more pleasing, to observe, that the interest thus excited appears to have given a new impulse to the zeal of the friends of the Church, which has urged them to extraordinary exertions in her behalf.

It has led to a wider study of theology.

The spirit it has awakened is practical and earnest.

It will hardly be considered by any one as a mere casual coincidence, that the last ten years should have been so signally marked by so many important undertakings in aid of her cause, begun in a confidence which not long ago would have been deemed romantic, and accomplished by sacrifices which would then have appeared almost inconceivable.

Still, whatever may be the amount of the advantage thus gained, it would undoubtedly be too dearly purchased, if the price paid for it were the admission of unsound doctrines, or a breach of unity, in the Church: and there are many persons who believe—this indeed is the very gist of the controversy—that one of these evils has befallen us, and to such a degree, that our only prospect of a remedy lies in the other: and there are others who, though differing widely in their view of the cause, look forward to the same result, some with friendly uneasiness, others with hostile exultation. Unhappily it cannot be denied that there is some ground for these anticipations: they are often expressed in a manner which tends to realise them: but still I trust that we are yet far removed from such a deplorable alternative. And as I am sure that you, my Reverend Brethren, all sympathize with me in the wish that this should prove to be the case, it may not be useless to state the reasons which have led me to this opinion, and which induce me to contemplate the present state of the controversy with much more of hope than of alarm.

Fears entertained.

The main ground of my persuasion is briefly this: that the controversy which now agitates the Church is not a new one: that, though distinguished by some peculiar features, yet at the bottom it is nothing more than a revival, or, as we may choose to call it, a continuation, of one which is as old as the first establishment of our Church: that it represents a contrast of opinions, views, and feelings, which has never ceased to exist within her pale, though varying in its outward demonstrations according to the shifting phases of her historical development: sometimes apparently dormant and inactive, at others breaking out, as now, in passionate controversy, and at some

The controversy not really a new one.

unhappy epochs—such as we hope may never again be witnessed —venting itself in persecution, in violent exclusion, and formal rupture. It is not only an indisputable fact, that such an opposition or divergency always has existed within the Church, but it seems likewise to be a necessary result of her constitution and character. If the position which she has taken up, as a Reformed Church, is correctly described as a mean between two extremes, it appears to be an inevitable consequence—so long as human nature continues what it is—that some of her members should incline toward one extreme, others toward its opposite, though all sincerely and equally attached to her doctrine and fellowship. If we are not ashamed of this character of moderation which distinguishes her, if, on the contrary, we rejoice in it, and regard it as her most honourable attribute, as the very stamp of prudence and charity combined, and the safest criterion of truth; then we must be content to pay the price of this high privilege, in that continual contrast of opinions, and that occasional collision of parties: though this view of the case ought undoubtedly to operate as a constant motive to mutual forbearance. It would indeed have been surprising, if, while the Church herself was accused by her Protestant adversaries of too great a leaning and resemblance to the Church of Rome, because she retained many things which they viewed as Romish errors and corruptions, those of her divines who laid the greatest stress on the things which were thus assailed, should not have incurred a like charge; or on the other hand, if those who most earnestly maintained the principles which separate her from the Roman Church, should not sometimes have fallen under a suspicion of indifference or disaffection toward the other parts of her system. This, which has in fact so often happened in former times, is the very thing which we are now witnessing.

Church of England comprehensive.

I am aware, however, that this observation will lead us but a little way toward a historical explanation of the present controversy, or of the movement which gave rise to it; and will still less enable us to understand what is peculiar in its cha-

Origin of the movement.

racter. It may be traced to a remote origin: but certainly it was not transmitted to us exactly in its present form. If the general outline remain the same, there is at least an air of novelty about its lineaments and colour: and however clearly we may perceive its identity, something more is required to account for its appearance at this time, and in this shape. There is indeed one very simple and easy way of cutting short this inquiry; that is, to refer the whole to some invisible supernatural agency. Viewed by different minds, and from opposite points, the same event may appear either as a gracious interposition of Divine Providence, or a machination of the great enemy of souls. So it was with the Reformation, and so it is with the movement which now agitates the Church. And doubtless in most events which have been brought about by human means, and extensively affected by human opinions, prejudices, and passions, there is such a mixture of good and evil, that even the same person may think he sees as much reason for referring them to the one author as to the other. But this is not the present question. As we should not understand the character of the Reformation at all the better, for being told that it was a work of God, so, to say, whether truly or not, that this movement is a device of Satan, would leave us as much as ever in the dark with regard to its nature, occasion, and proximate causes. Nor again does it appear to me, that a knowledge of the immediate occasion from which it arose, can throw any light upon its nature, or assist us toward forming an estimate of its worth. But we do gain a notion of it, which, though it may not be complete, is certainly very important, and perhaps the only one with which, as ministers of the Church, we are practically concerned, when we are led by the language both of its friends and its adversaries, to consider it as a reaction, an attempt to counteract a religious system, which it found existing, and gaining ground within the Church. According to the descriptions which have been given of this system by those who profess to be resisting it, it is represented as one which undervalues the authority of the Church, disregards her ordinances, neglects her ritual, disparages the sacraments, virtually abandons some of her

System to which it is opposed.

peculiar doctrines, destroys the proportion of her theology, and contracts its compass, by the undue prominence given to a few articles of faith, substitutes empty phrases, barren, unreal notions, sensible excitement, feelings, and impressions, for the substance of religion, for true devotion, for the conscientious discharge of social duties, for habits of self-denial and charity, for the diligent cultivation and practical exercise of Christian virtues; and thus tends to diffuse a kind of antinomianism, which is only the more dangerous, on account of the subtlety and refinement, by which it eludes superficial observation and abstains from all that would offend decency and common sense.

The Evangelical Party.

If it were true that such a system as this had been introduced into the Church, and was making progress, there can be no doubt that those who undertook to expose and combat it would be entitled to our sympathy, even though we might not agree with them in all their principles, or approve of all the remedies they proposed for the evil. But though it is certain that one of the parties in the controversy represents itself as contending against such a system, several of their opponents have not only indignantly disclaimed all connexion with it, but have seemed altogether to deny its existence, and to treat it as a mere fiction, with which their antagonists have either deceived themselves, or endeavoured to impose upon others: and which tends, in its effect, if not in its design, to check the growth of vital religion, by casting undeserved obloquy on a portion of the Church, which is more especially distinguished by its close adherence to the principles of the Gospel, even if it be not entitled to a name, which imports that it is in the exclusive possession of them. There would indeed be just ground for the indignation which has been expressed on this subject, if the system above described had ever been imputed to the individuals who have disavowed it. But it seems perfectly consistent with the highest respect for them, and with the fullest admission of every thing they have asserted with regard to their own consciousness, practice, experience, and observation, to believe, that the evil is not so purely imaginary as they have represented it. It is a question of fact, on which no

man ought to accept another's assertion as proof. But in the absence of what can never be given—a proof of the negative—it seems no more than common charity requires, to believe that those who profess to be setting themselves against such a system, are sincerely convinced of its reality. As little can I doubt that this conviction has been shared by numbers beside, and that this has been a main cause of the acceptance which writings directed against the system have met with. My own opinion on such a point can have no more weight than that of any other person, who has been used to pay attention to such subjects. But I must avow that the result of my observation has been a very strong impression both of the reality, and of the extensive prevalence of the evil.

A party may have differences in itself.

And this suggests another remark, which may possibly be of some use toward soothing the apprehensions of persons who view the course which the controversy has taken with alarm. When we hear of a school or party, which is charged with an attempt to introduce dangerous innovations into the Church, and are informed that it comprises a large proportion of the Clergy, and a great number of the Laity, it is very necessary that we should accustom ourselves to distinguish between the Teachers and the Disciples, the Guides and the Followers: that we should remember that there may be a general sympathy and approbation, which does not exclude many differences of opinion, even on important points; that general principles may be adopted, but not in the sense or the spirit in which they were propounded, and without any of the inferences which are drawn from them, either by their advocates, or their impugners. Indeed examples of such partial disagreement have already appeared: nor perhaps would it be difficult to point out indications of considerable divergency in the writers who are considered as the leaders and organs of the party. But at least there seems to be no reason to suspect that the mass of those with whom their principles have found favour, are not heartily attached to the Church in her present form, or that they are dissatisfied with the language of her formularies, or desirous of any change in

her public worship, not perfectly consistent with her existing Canons and Rubric.

The real question at issue.

But to many persons all that I have been hitherto saying on this subject will probably appear quite foreign to what they regard as the main question: that is, whether errors have not been maintained within the Church, by some of her authorised teachers, which are so clearly subversive of the fundamental articles of her faith, that they cannot be safely tolerated. The question, it must be observed, is not as to the absolute and exact coincidence of every thing that has been advanced with the doctrine of the Church, but as to the amount and importance of any supposed departure from it: not whether statements have been made, which are not fully borne out by her authentic language, but whether any such as are essentially inconsistent with her vital principles: so far exceeding the just limits of private speculation, as to violate the terms of communion, and to render those who persist in them guilty of a breach of their most solemn ministerial engagements. Much may have been said that may demand very earnest attention, that may be a fit subject for warning or censure: but if it stop short of this point, it ought not to disturb the peace of the Church, but may be safely left to await the issue of free discussion. I must own that I have hitherto met with nothing to convince me, that matters have been brought to such a melancholy extremity. It would manifestly be both impracticable and unseasonable to enter at large into the grounds on which my judgment has been formed: but I will offer a few observations on some of the subjects with regard to which others seem to have been led to an opposite conclusion.

The doctrine of Justification. Dr. Newman.

Though different writers have fixed on different points in the system of their opponents, as the hinges of the controversy, the most prominent place seems to have been generally assigned to the doctrine which is the subject of our Eleventh Article, and which has been emphatically described as the test of a standing or falling Church. A very elaborate theory has been proposed on this subject by an eminent writer,* which has been denounced on the other

* Newman. "Lectures on Justification."

side as radically false and utterly irreconcilable with our Church's teaching on that head: and equally elaborate attempts have been made to shew, that this is the root from which all the other errors of the author's system have sprung. With regard to my own impression, I can only say, that after the closest attention I could give to the dispute, I view it as one of words, involving no real difference of opinion, and consequently look upon both parties as in this respect equally orthodox. But there are some facts, which, if they do not clearly point to the same conclusion, seem to me to furnish a strong reason for the exercise of peculiar caution and moderation in our judgments on this question. One of these facts is, that the modern theory is admitted to harmonise very closely with that of Bishop Bull, who certainly believed his views to be in perfect accordance with the formularies of his Church, and though warmly attacked, was never, as far as I know, charged with any of the consequences which have been supposed to flow from them in their more recent form. And I may add, that the work in which Bishop Bull proposed his theory, the *Harmonia Apostolica*, was strongly recommended to the Clergy of this Diocese by Bishop Horsley in his Charge at his Primary Visitation, as a "preservative from the contagion of the Antinomian folly." Another fact, still more important, and I think not sufficiently borne in mind, is, that the principal terms employed in the discussion of the subject, which are therefore of most frequent occurrence, admit of so many different senses, that there is perpetual danger of confusion and misunderstanding:* so that an eager disputant may carry on the contest through a bulky volume, and yet leave his antagonist's position untouched. When this is the case, nothing is more natural than that complaints should be made of obscurity, confusion, paradox, and self-contradiction: and accordingly, in no part of the controversy do we hear such complaints more frequently and strongly expressed, than in that which relates to this point.† But though I have not been able to perceive

* See Jeremy Taylor's Sermon: "Fides Formata." Works, Vol. vi. p. 268, ed. Heber.

† It seems very doubtful whether a collection of seemingly paradoxical and self-contradictory passages torn from the context of a closely reasoned work, can contribute much either to enlighten the ignorant, or to convince gainsayers.

that the doctrine of the Eleventh Article has been put in any peril by the manner in which it is exhibited in that theory, or that the theory affords the slightest countenance to the Romish doctrine of Merit, I am not the less convinced that the ordinary mode of stating the doctrine of our Church, against which the author so vehemently protests, both expresses it correctly, and sufficiently guards, so far as words can do so, against the abuse of it: and I know of nothing that is likely to be gained by the substitution of any other, unless it be, that it may serve to rouse attention, to exercise thought, and to prevent the mechanical repetition, and consequent idolising, of a formula.

Scripture and Tradition.

Much offence and alarm has been caused by statements with regard to the relation between Scripture and Tradition, which have been put forward on one side as neglected and almost forgotten truths, and condemned on the other as repugnant to the spirit at least of our Sixth Article, and a virtual abandonment of a fundamental principle of our Reformation. No topic of the recent controversy has been more fruitful than this: none, it may perhaps be added, has led to more important and profitable inquiries. If it be true, as seems hardly to be denied, that Tradition had not only become "to most of us an unpalatable word," but one of "vague use," and "closely associated in most men's minds with a whole host of partialities and antipathies," then certainly we have reason to congratulate ourselves, that so much has been done of late to clear up its ambiguity, to distinguish and ascertain its various meanings, and to enable us, whether we relish it or not, to use it calmly and soberly, in its proper place, and with a right conception of its import. For my present purpose it will be sufficient to express my opinion, that the progress of the controversy has shown that the difference between the two parties on this point is not one of principle, but of fact. There is no dispute

No dispute as to the supreme authority.

as to the nature of the supreme authority in matters of faith: it is admitted to be not the decision of uninspired men in any age, much less of any human arbitrator, but the teaching of our Lord and His Apostles: but one question is, whether any record of that teaching is still

to be found, beside that which is contained in Holy Writ. Those who have most magnified the authority of Tradition have proceeded on the supposition, express or implied, that the Tradition they speak of has preserved a portion of that teaching. They are met with the assertion, that either no such record exists, or that it is impossible to discover it. This is certainly a fair subject for historical investigation and argument. But it is not this that constitutes the most interesting and important point of variance: the main point is the relation in which Tradition is made to stand to Scripture. If Scripture not only contains all things necessary to salvation, but delivers them so plainly that every one may find them there for himself, it is comparatively of little moment, whether fragments of the teaching of our Lord and His Apostles have or have not been preserved elsewhere. But if Scripture itself needs an interpreter, it becomes a question of the highest importance, whether there exists any Tradition capable of discharging that office, and how far it is to be trusted. And here the divergency between the opposite parties appears at first sight very great indeed: the one urging all that can be said to prove the obscurity of Scripture, the other insisting on its plainness and perspicuity. Nevertheless, on closer inspection, the points on which they agree will perhaps be found both more numerous and more essential than those on which they differ. It seems to be admitted on both sides, that the right understanding of Scripture is not to be attained by the exercise of the unassisted reason: that it depends on certain moral conditions, and a certain measure of spiritual illumination. And even those who contend that this is the only assistance absolutely necessary, would hardly deny, that the experiment has rarely, if ever, been tried: or that the persons who come to the study of Scripture with such assistance, also generally bring with them notions and impressions derived from early instruction. Nor again is it maintained by either party, that the sufficiency of Scripture is such as to render all other external helps to the right understanding of it useless. That would be condemned as a mark of ignorant presumption, or

The dispute is as to the need of an interpreter.

of blind enthusiasm. It is admitted, that "there are many useful guides to the truth besides the Scriptures of which the writings of the early Fathers are one, and an important one."* But further, it is not pretended, that to appeal to the consent of primitive antiquity, for the purpose of ascertaining the sense of Scripture on articles of faith, is any peculiarity of the modern school which is charged with unduly exalting the authority of Tradition. On the contrary it has been laid down by an eminent living divine, who is not only unconnected with that school, but one of its most zealous opponents, that "in the settlement of articles of faith on the authority of Scripture, the principle of the Anglican Church is that of an appeal to the recorded consent of primitive antiquity from the very beginning."† Here indeed it has been justly observed by others, that if this consent is to be taken in its strict sense, as including the assent of every individual Christian in any age of the Church, it is something which either never existed, or at least is utterly incapable of proof. And this observation—if it was ever needed—is certainly very valuable. But how far the consent of the great majority may be properly considered as answering the same purpose, and again, how far such a consent is represented by any records which have been preserved to us —these are questions on which every one may be allowed to form his own opinion. So far then we discover no difference as to any principle which is peculiar to any modern school.

The apparent difference of principle.

But when we proceed a step further, we meet with an apparent difference of principle, and one which has been represented as of vital moment. For the consent of antiquity, in whatever sense it is understood, may be regarded either as simply the evidence of a witness, or as the authoritative decision of an infallible judge. And this indeed sounds like a very important distinction, though I must own that it appears to me a difference more of sound than of substance. For if it is the character of the witness, and not the nature of his testimony, that makes his evidence decisive, it seems to matter

* Goode. "Divine Rule of Faith and Practice," I. p. 18.

† Faber: "Primitive Doctrine of Justification," 2nd ed. p. 365.

little, as to the practical result, which view we take. The exercise of private judgment on the doctrine delivered is equally excluded by each. But even this point is one in which the controversy of our day is not concerned. The party which appeals to the consent of antiquity professes to hold, that "the Scripture is the sole authoritative source of the Faith," i. e. "of things to be believed in order to salvation, and that the Church only testifies to her children what truths are necessary to be believed in order to salvation, in subjection to Scripture; and even when she determines controversies, does this not in the character of a judge, but as a witness to what she herself received."* I am aware, unhappily, that it has been not unfrequently insinuated, that such professions are not to be trusted. I do not inquire whether insinuations of this kind are charitable or just. I only notice them for the purpose of remarking, that when we are speaking about terms of communion, it is only the doctrines which men profess that we can take as the ground of our judgment, as we have no other means of discovering what they really hold. For the same reason I pass over the attempts which have been made, by disputable inferences, to prove, that a principle has been admitted, in appeals to Tradition on points as to which Scripture is silent, which, if followed out, would open a door for the corruptions of Romanism. And on the other hand I must observe, that the object which I have now in view does not lead me even to inquire, whether the language which has been employed to convey certain views of doctrine, is not liable to grave objections, or just censure, as ambiguous, or unguarded, harsh, extravagant, and ill-sounding. It is not with modes of expression that we are at present concerned, but with the nature of the things expressed. This is a remark which it is particularly

* Pusey: "Letter to Bishop of Oxford," p. 31, 3rd ed. The whole passage runs thus:—"In brief, then, my Lord, the meaning of our Church (as we conceive) in these Articles is, that the Scripture is the sole authoritative source of the Faith, i.e. of 'things to be believed in order to salvation;' the Church is the medium through which that knowledge is conveyed to individuals; she, under her responsibility to God, and in subjection to His Scripture, and with the guidance of His Spirit, testifies to her children, what truths are to be believed in order to salvation; expounds Scripture to them; determines when controversies arise; and this, not in the character of a judge, but as a 'witness' to what she herself received."

necessary to bear in mind, when we proceed to touch upon another class of questions, which has been the subject of very vehement controversy, those I mean which relate to the doctrine of the Apostolical Succession in its connection with that of the Sacraments.

Doctrine of Apostolical Succession.

Here we must be careful not to lose sight of the distinction between the doctrines themselves, and the connection in which they stand, or have been placed, with one another. For it is this connection, very much more than the doctrines themselves, or even the manner in which they have been stated, that has given offence to many excellent persons. It is not I believe disputed by any one, that what is called the high doctrine of the Apostolical Succession (including, i.e., not only the historical fact, that the ministry of our Church is derived by uninterrupted descent from the Apostles, but likewise that it was established by them as a permanent and unalterable institution, to be continued according to certain invariable regulations), I say it is hardly disputed that this doctrine has been held by so large a part of our best divines, and has received so much apparent countenance from the anxiety shown to preserve the succession when it was in danger of interruption, that it would be unreasonable to complain of it as a novelty, or even to represent it as being now exclusively held by a particular school. Again, whatever ground there may be for the charge brought against one party in the controversy, that it has exaggerated the importance and the efficacy of the Sacraments, it does not appear to involve any question of principle. Indeed, since the Church herself teaches, that the Sacraments are *generally necessary to salvation*, it seems difficult for any one to exaggerate their importance, unless he were to hold, what I believe no one maintains, that the necessity is not merely general, but universal and absolute.

Its relation to the sacraments.

So, language may have been used, which afforded just reason for jealousy and fear, lest their dignity should be so magnified as to exclude the use of other means of grace, or as to substitute means for ends, or as to encourage the belief that their efficacy is wholly independent of internal qualifications. But since these consequences are disavowed by those who have been charged

with them, it does not seem possible to draw a line between the general principles of the opposite parties on this head. But it has been very truly observed, that "men may over-estimate the efficacy of the Sacraments, to the disparagement of prayer and preaching, and reading the Scriptures, and yet be perfectly clear from the opinion which makes this efficacy depend immediately on a human administrator. And so again, men may hold episcopacy to be divine, and the episcopacy of Apostolical Succession to be the only true episcopacy, but yet they may utterly reject the notion of its being essential to the efficacy of the Sacraments."* And the opinion of such a connection between the two doctrines has been condemned both as groundless and pernicious. But I conceive that it may not be useless to observe, that there is a sense in which the connection between them would be neither so arbitrary, nor pregnant with such dangerous consequences. If any one believes that the ministerial commission may be traced through the Apostles to the Head of the Church, and that it was originally designed to comprehend the administration of the Sacraments, then he will be naturally led to consider the character of the Minister as a part of the ordinance: and it will follow, that he cannot look upon it as altogether immaterial, whether this part be absent or not: he will not venture to say that the ordinance would be, to all intents and purposes, the same without it: and this he might express by saying that the Apostolical Succession is requisite for the *due application of it.* But it would not follow that he undertakes to pronounce how far it is an essential part, or to what degree its absence affects the efficacy of the rite, or that there are not many circumstances in which it may be safely omitted, and in which its place will be surely and effectually supplied.† In a word, there appears to be nothing in the doctrine itself that is exclusive or uncharitable, beyond what is implied in a strong preference of one communion over another. Its character will depend on the temper in which it is embraced: and since

* Arnold: "Sermons on Christian Life." Introduction, p. xxxvii.

† Compare an extract from a work of Bishop Cosin, in Brewer's Memoir of the Author, prefixed to his edition of "The History of Popish Transubstantiation," p. xxxi.

those who maintain it most firmly, still declare their belief that "God's favour is not limited to the bounds of his heritage, but that, in the Church, or out of the Church, every one that calleth on the name of the Lord with a pure and perfect heart, shall be saved," * we would hope that its influence may in most cases be found consistent both with charity and humility. The prudence of putting forward such a doctrine as an instrument of controversy, is a different question. A weapon which may irritate an adversary, but does not weaken him, would seem to be best kept in its sheath. Those who are already hostile to the Church, are not likely to be won by the revival of what they must deem an extravagant pretension: and those who are indifferent to her more evident advantages, will hardly be attracted by one so questionable, and so remote from common apprehension, that the belief in it is entertained with reluctance by many of those who admit it. †

Reserve in communicating religious knowledge.

I shall touch very briefly on another subject, which has, I think, occupied an undue share of public attention, and has excited much misplaced feeling: and indeed, but for that notoriety, I should have had no inducement on this occasion to notice it at all. I mean the Tracts "on Reserve in communicating religious knowledge." The point of the charges which have been made against their author is, that he had recommended the suppressing or withholding some of the fundamental truths of religion. He himself however has publicly disclaimed the meaning imputed to him, and has denied that it could be fairly inferred from his language. According to his own professions, his object was not to recommend or sanction the suppression of religious knowledge, but to lay down the principles which, as he conceived, ought to regulate the mode of communicating it. Now here, as before, I do not inquire whether it be consistent with charity or candour to repeat the accusation just as if no such disavowal and explanation had ever been offered; it is enough to say, that the Church can properly take cognizance only of doc-

* Newman. "Sermons," vi. p. 186.

† Advertisement to Vol. II. of the "Tracts for the Times:" quoted by Mr. Goode in his pamphlet, "The Case as it is," p. 19.

trines which are professed or acknowledged: as she cannot be reproached with allowing any of her ministers to teach an erroneous doctrine which they have either retracted or disavowed. But the agitation which has been produced by the treatise in question, induces me to add a few remarks. When I consider the character of several of the persons by whom the author's meaning has been, according to his own assertion, misunderstood, I am not at liberty to doubt, that he must in some passages have expressed himself in obscure and incautious terms. On the other hand it is certain, that not a few readers who took up the Tracts under an unfavourable prepossession derived from report and from quotations, were led by a perusal of the whole to a widely different conception of its real import. The title itself would certainly seem to indicate an object very different from suppression: as reserve in communicating appears to imply some kind of communication: not to mention the important distinction, with which we are all familiar in religious subjects, between the communication of knowledge as a merely intellectual process, and that of truth as a moral one. But if we take a much surer test than any of these, and judge of the author's drift from the character of the system which he professes to reprobate, we must be inclined to consider it rather as a protest against reserve, than a recommendation of it. If, as he, whether with or without good reason, assumed, there was a popular mode of teaching, which dwelt almost exclusively on a portion of the truth, so as virtually to withhold and suppress others not less important, the natural remedy for the evil would have been, not to keep one part back, but to bring the rest more prominently forward. That the treatise is deficient in practical directions for the application of its principles, has been admitted by its defenders.* But it may still be profitable, if it tends to warn us against the danger of partial views and exhibitions of the truth, and to lead us more carefully to preserve both the fulness and the proportion of faith.

The Tract open to the charge of obscurity.

* See "A brief Analysis of the Tract on Reserve in Communicating Religious Knowledge," by Henry Arthur Woodgate, B.D.

Some much more important, as well as difficult, questions are suggested by the last Tract of the Series, entitled "Remarks on certain passages in the Thirty-nine Articles." The objections which have been made to this essay—and it has incurred the censure of persons whose prepossessions were all in its favour—have been directed partly against the author's principle of interpretation, and partly against the manner in which he applies it in his treatment of the passages which are the subject of his remarks. And these are points which must be carefully distinguished, and considered separately. With regard to the principle itself, it appears to me that much misapprehension has prevailed, and that it has been stated by others in a manner which the writer's language does not warrant. It has been sometimes represented as if he held it allowable for one who subscribes the Articles to reject their obvious, literal, and grammatical sense, and to substitute another more conformable to his own preconceived notion of Catholic doctrine. This indeed is a principle which would be alarmingly dangerous, if it were not so flagrantly absurd. But I do not perceive that it is implied, either in the account which the author gives of his object, at the outset, or in the concluding remarks with which he meets a supposed objection. I hardly understand how it can be reconciled with either: his professed object being to show, that the Articles contain no propositions or terms inconsistent with the Catholic faith: and the objection which he anticipates being, that the interpretation proposed, though it may give the grammatical sense, is not in harmony with the known opinions of the framers. The objection itself assumes, I think, that no violence has been done to the grammatical sense; and the answer given to it, though including several distinct heads, seems to amount to this: that one who subscribes to the Articles professes his assent to the opinions of their framers, so far as they are distinctly expressed in the Articles themselves, but no farther; and that he is not bound to adopt those which he may find recorded in their other writings, for the purpose of either limiting or enlarging the grammatical

Tract XC. The author's principle of interpretation.

sense of the Articles; so that, where a proposition is expressed in general terms, he is at liberty to differ from the framers as to those points which are left undefined. The author conceives, and endeavours to show by historical evidence, that the Articles were framed with the intention of allowing large room for difference of opinion on subordinate questions. His view of this subject has been severely censured, as subjecting our Reformers to the charge of disingenuousness; which no doubt they would have justly incurred, if they had designedly used equivocal language. But a proposition may be general, yet not equivocal: it may be meant, and may serve, to secure unanimity among those who assent to it, to a certain extent, though not to exclude a variety of sentiments beyond that limit.

Manner in which the principle is applied.

Whatever then may be thought as to the matter of fact, the principle of interpretation, so stated, appears to contain nothing either absurd or dangerous: and more than this, the author seems neither to have asked, nor—which is more important—to have wanted for his purpose. The manner in which he has applied his principle in the treatment of the Articles on which he has commented, is of course a totally distinct question. And here I think no impartial person can deny that there is much to justify the sensation of surprise and alarm which was excited in so many, and some very friendly quarters, by the first appearance of the Tract. This impression was perhaps the stronger, because the notion of a compromise between extreme opinions on a common ground had been least of all associated in most minds with the Articles which it discusses. But even when this view has been admitted, the construction put upon several passages will certainly appear to ordinary readers excessively refined and artificial, such in fact as could scarcely have occurred to the writer, if his judgement had not been biassed by his wishes. Such is still my own impression, after all I have seen adduced in defence or explanation of the Tract, though I think it sufficient to repel the imputation of a conscious obliquity of view. And the character of the Church required that such a mode of interpreting her formularies

should be publicly discountenanced. But on the other hand suspicions have been suggested by the Tract, as to the drift of the whole, and the ultimate tendency of the author's views, which appear to be wide of his real aim, and meaning. His interpretation of the Twenty-second Article, which, more than any other part of his Remarks, has given rise to these suspicions, is indeed, in my judgement, quite untenable. Even if the compilers of that Article had not been acquainted with the decrees of the Council of Trent on the subjects mentioned in it, they could not have described some of the grossest abuses of the unreformed practice as *the Romish doctrine*, nor would they probably have pronounced so mild a censure on such enormities as is expressed in the terms "a fond thing vainly invented, and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the word of God." This would surely have been at the same time much less and much more than belonged to such a subject. And again, whatever might have been the case with the framers of the Article, the authority which imposed it, after the decrees of the Council had been published, could not have thought that it did not condemn the Romish doctrine according to the latest and most authentic exposition of it. In fact, however, it was *the doctrine of the Schoolmen* that the framers of the Article originally condemned, and the epithet *Romish* was afterwards substituted with distinct reference to the decrees of Trent. The author of the Tract therefore seems to have fallen into a manifest error,* when he attempts, on chronological grounds, to limit the meaning of the Article, so as not to comprehend the decrees of the Council of Trent on the same points. But though his remark as to the date of the Articles is general, still, since the distinction which he draws between the Romish doctrine, and that of Trent, is strictly limited to this single Article—for in no other does the expression *Romish doctrine* occur —it cannot be inferred that he intended to intimate, that the

Interpretation of the Twenty-second Article.

Attempted distinction between Romish and Tridentine doctrine.

[* See this clearly proved by the late Bishop of Exeter in his "Letters to Charles Butler, Esq.," New Edition, 1866, pp. 319, 20.—Ed.

teaching of the Council is consistent with that of the Church of England on any other points. It would indeed be sufficiently alarming to believe that he thought this was the case with regard to these. But though the language of the Tract, taken by itself, might very easily suggest such a surmise, and is on that account deserving of censure, as it might fall in the way of persons who had no other means of learning the author's real sentiments, I think it is clear from his subsequent explanation of his meaning, that the immediate purport of his remark was to signify a distinction between the letter of the decrees of Trent, and the spirit in which it has been interpreted in the Romish schools, and by the practice of the Church of Rome. And also that what he would have licensed as an admissible private opinion on the subject of the Article, is not reconcilable even with the letter of those decrees, unless on a very forced and arbitrary interpretation. But I must add, that the liberty for which he pleads on some points, is much larger than the grounds which he assigns for it. On subjects, as to which nothing can be known to us but by revelation, it cannot be altogether innocent, or safe, to adopt, even as matter of private belief, any doctrine which has not been revealed. It is either a presumptuous abuse of our mental faculties, or it is suffering ourselves to be *beguiled* by others, who have rashly and vainly *intruded into those things which they have not seen.* It diverts the mind from the contemplation of certain and useful truths: it tends directly to introduce superstitious practice. Even therefore if our Church had been silent as to the state of the departed—which is far from the case, since she makes it the subject of prayer—it would not have followed that any of her children is at liberty to hold a doctrine on that subject, as matter of belief, *whatever be its merits,* merely because it is in some sense *primitive,* and *is a possible or probable opinion,* that is to say, a conjecture not involving any absurdity: much less to hold a doctrine which is apparently as much opposed to that of our Church, as the idea of *punishment* is to that of *joy and felicity,* and *the absence of God's presence* to *the living with Him.*

Prayer for the dead.

Before I conclude, I must still advert to another feature in the controversy, which has contributed more than any other to give it that air of novelty which I have already noticed. All the propositions maintained by the writers of the modern school put together, have probably produced much less effect on the mind of the public, than the language in which some of them have spoken of the Church of Rome on the one hand, and of our Reformers on the other. That divines of our communion should speak of the Roman Church in terms not merely of indulgence, but of reverence, of tenderness, of affection, while they spoke harshly and disparagingly, not to say bitterly and contemptuously, of the Reformers, the Reformation, and Protestantism, was not only startling and offensive, but raised a suspicion, that where so much was said in spite of public opinion, and against the spirit of the times, still more might be meant, and only reserved for a more favourable juncture. And this suspicion was of course greatly strengthened by expressions which fell from the same quarter, and which seemed to intimate a secret design of effecting some change of undefined extent in the character of our Church. Now such language, taken by itself, however unseemly, intemperate, uncharitable, and unjust, would not, as I have repeatedly observed, come within the scope of my present remarks. It is only because it has been represented as an alarming indication, and has excited apprehensions of danger, that I am now induced to notice it. And there are several considerations which lead me to think, that in this point of view its importance has been greatly exaggerated. It would perhaps be sufficient to say, not only ought large allowance to be made for expressions dropped in the warmth of controversial discussion, but, it is not during the course of a controversy that the parties usually bestow their attention impartially on the opposite sides of a question, or are careful to balance their own judgments on men and things with those of their opponents, or to accompany their statements with all the modifications and supplements which may be necessary for a complete view of the subject. They are occupied with one

Language used of the Church of Rome and of the Reformers.

aspect or portion of the truth, and may seem to forget that there is any other: they bring it prominently forward, and appear to depress all that they leave untouched: they omit what does not concern their immediate object, and are thought to exclude it. A person who is absorbed in the contemplation of some particular merit or defect of a system, will be apt to use general terms or illustrations, which would be improper and extravagant if applied to the whole: as, if he conceived that our Church was suffering deeply from the restraint laid upon her general assemblies, he might be tempted to speak of her condition as a degrading bondage, though he would be the last to approve of such language as a general description of her case. I think there is not only room to hope, but reason to believe, that this will prove to be the true account of much that has caused general disquietude in the polemical theology of our day. But there are some other points which ought not to be overlooked, when we are estimating the importance which is to be attached to the expressions of favourable feeling which have lately been used by members of our communion with regard to the Church of Rome. It ought not to be forgotten, that a general change has taken place in the common tone of sentiment on this subject; and that modes of speaking about it have become familiar to us, which would not have been tolerated while the struggle of the Reformation was yet recent. The opinion by which Hooker offended so many of his contemporaries, that "God was merciful to save thousands of our fathers living in popish superstitions, inasmuch as they sinned ignorantly," would not now be thought by many a great stretch of liberality. It has not been without its effect, that so very many of our countrymen have been used to look at the externals of the Roman Catholic worship, with feelings like those with which an intelligent lover of the fine arts views the beautiful remains of Pagan antiquity. But there is another state of mind, widely different from this, and equally removed from antiquarian enthusiasm, and from religious indifference, but which neverthe-

Persons occupied with one aspect of truth will neglect another.

Change of feeling towards the Church of Rome.

less may manifest itself in a somewhat similar result. It has been described by a writer of the school which is charged with a tendency to Romanism, in the remark,—"We are in no danger of becoming Romanists, and may bear to be dispassionate, and (I may say) philosophical in our treatment of their errors."* On the same principle persons who have not only condemned, but have laboriously exposed the errors, corruptions, and reigning spirit of the Church of Rome, might not unnaturally think themselves the more at liberty to give utterance not only to their general feelings of charity towards her, but likewise to all those which might be excited by the fairer sides of her past history and her present condition, and more especially by the works of many of her great writers. This however will not, I am aware, serve at all to defend or account for the language which has been applied to the Reformers, the Reformation, and Protestantism, and which has given, in many cases, I think, very just offence. But I also think that a very unfair use has often been made of this language for the purposes of controversy. Persons who have spoken moderately themselves, have been made answerable, by a harsh construction, for the expressions used by their friends, and then conclusions have been drawn from these expressions, which they do not warrant. And it has happened that some of those which are in themselves most censurable, have nevertheless been most abused, and afford the least ground of alarm. I fully sympathise with the indignation which has been roused by the arbitrary misuse of the word Protestantism, by which its meaning has been limited to a mere negation of everything that men on both sides profess to revere. But still it seems evident that those who so misuse the word can only be understood according to the sense which they themselves, however unwarrantably, attach to it: and that their meaning is perverted, if what they say of Protestantism is applied to what others, in a very different sense, call the Protestant Religion. It cannot indeed be denied that expressions have been deliberately used which clearly imply a certain degree of dissatisfaction with

Misuse of the word Protestantism.

* "Tracts for the Times," No. 79, p. 3.

the present state of the Church, a certain desire of change, a certain regret mingled with disapprobation at the course pursued by some of our Reformers, and especially at the extent to which they were swayed by foreign influence. But I have yet to learn that such views and feelings are inconsistent with the obligations of a Minister of our Church, or with a sincere attachment to her. I know of no authority that is entitled to prescribe to any of us the opinions which he must hold on the history of the Church, or the lessons which he must gather from it: and I have no wish to see such an authority established, whether it is to be administered by a few or by the many. Rather I would say, we cannot be too cautious of every approach toward such an odious and pernicious species of spiritual tyranny. If any one is convinced, that the Reformation has left nothing to desire, and that it has taken away nothing that we ought to regret, he may well be content with the pleasure of such a belief, without seeking to force it upon others as a duty. I would only observe that a contrary persuasion is at all events nothing peculiar to any party in the present controversy. An admirable person, in whose premature removal the Church and the nation have to deplore a loss which will not be soon repaired, one of the most strenuous as well as able opponents of the school which is reproached with partiality to Romanism, had observed with his characteristic candour: "No wise man doubts that the Reformation was imperfect, or that in the Romish system there were many good institutions, and practices, and feelings, which it would be most desirable to restore among ourselves."* There may be a difference which I am not able to appreciate, between the desire to restore and the wish to reappropriate, but I think it can hardly be so great, that while the one term is inoffensive, the other should throw the Church and the country into a ferment. I am glad however to see that an explanation has been offered of some of the phrases which had given the greatest offence, not so much because I should myself have thought it

Liberty of opinion not to be straitened.

* Arnold: "Sermons on Christian Life." Introduction, p. lvi.

necessary, as because it indicates a spirit of conciliation which seems to me the thing that is most needed on both sides.* I will add but one word before I drop the subject. It has been alleged as an objection against the movement which gave rise to this controversy, that its tendency is directly counter to the spirit of the age, and betrays that its authors have been misled by a blind antipathy, which prevents them from discerning between the good and the evil in the character of their own times. I do not know whether the fact warrants the inference: but doubtless so to set ourselves above the spirit of our age, would be no less foolish and blamable than the idolatrous admiration which bows to it as infallibly wise, and perfectly good. I would only observe that if such be the real nature of the movement, there can be little reason for alarm about its progress. It is as if one should dread a series of encroachments on the bed of the sea, because an attempt has been somewhere made to shut it out by a dike.

Practical warning.

I am aware, my Reverend Brethren, that the language of moderation is commonly least welcome where it is most needed. For this very reason I confidently hope that what I have said will by you be kindly received and favourably interpreted. And I will now conclude this address, which has already exceeded its just limits, with a very few words of practical advice. Be on your guard against the illusions of names and phrases, and against the influence of authority, in this matter. You may perhaps suffer no loss, though you should have no means of forming an opinion on the merits of this controversy; but you would sustain a grievous loss, if you should borrow your opinion of it from others: you would have surrendered the independence of your judgment, and be in danger of becoming the instruments of a party against your real views and intentions. Remember that, though words are the necessary vehicle of truth, they mostly

* "Explanation of a Passage in an Article on certain Works of Bishop Jewell, published in the *British Critic* for July, 1841, in a Letter to the Rev. Charles Smith Bird." By the Writer of the Article. See particularly pp. 65—71.

represent it but imperfectly, and that the form in which a proposition is conveyed, though very important, is much less so than the spirit in which it is interpreted and applied. Set the highest value on those truths which both parties profess, and on the authorities to which they both appeal: you will probably find that they afford an ample range for your professional studies, and sufficient directions both for faith and practice. Be still more circumspect as to that which you communicate to others, than as to what you adopt for yourselves. Let the wants, rather than the tastes, of your hearers supply the measure of your teaching. If you perceive that their prevailing tendency is to overrate the value of their privileges as Churchmen, to place an undue reliance on the efficacy of outward ordinances, to build their hopes less on the Divine mercy than on their strict attention to the performance of their social and religious duties, then it will be incumbent on you to warn them against the danger of bigotry and superstition, of formalism and legality. If on the other hand their leaning appears to be rather in the opposite direction, if the predominant failing is indifference about all visible bonds of Christian union, an inordinate craving for religious excitement, an impatience and contempt of all forms of devotion which do not minister to this appetite, a disposition to regard its gratification as the substance of all spiritual blessings, and to make it a substitute for steady, uniform, active piety, charity, and self-denial; you would not be *rightly dividing the word of truth*, unless you dwelt frequently and earnestly on that side of it which you find to be most generally overlooked. Should you even, by this faithful discharge of your duty, incur the reproach of preaching yourselves, or seeking to magnify your own office, you need not be ashamed of your work, so long as you have the witness of your conscience, that you only *study to show yourselves approved unto God.* And you will never want a sufficient share of the approbation and confidence of men, if you only take heed that your conduct adorn and illustrate your doctrine, "that"—to borrow the language of a great Father of our Church—"as by

Care requisite in instructing others.

your Sermons you preach in season, so, by your lives you may preach out of season, that is, at all seasons, and to all men, that they, seeing your good works, may glorify God, on your behalf and on their own."*

* Jeremy Taylor. Sermon I. "On the Minister's Duty." Works, vol. vi., p. 506.

II.

A CHARGE

DELIVERED SEPTEMBER, 1845.

THE RUBRIC AND THE CELEBRATION OF PUBLIC SERVICE.—THE GRANT FOR THE COLLEGE OF MAYNOOTH.

MY REVEREND BRETHREN,

THE interval which has elapsed since we were last assembled on this occasion has been marked by several occurrences more or less deeply affecting the condition and prospects of the Church; some of them of such a nature as to engage an uncommon share of public attention, and to excite much uneasiness, and even alarm, in the minds of thoughtful observers who take a lively interest in her welfare. This excitement cannot yet be said to have altogether subsided. But with regard at least to one subject, which disturbed the peace of the Church more especially in the course of last year, it appears to have so far abated, that many of those who experienced the greatest degree of alarm would now be ready to own that the danger had been considerably magnified by their fears. In times such as those in which our lot is cast, my brethren, it is to be expected that this will often be the case: that, according to the view taken by individuals of the character and tendency of passing events, the aspect of affairs in the Church will often seem to justify apprehensions which afterwards prove groundless. And it is very desirable that we should all endeavour constantly to bear in mind, that a period such as that which intervenes between two of our ordinary conferences, though not an inconsiderable portion of human life, is but as a moment in the

existence of the Church: and again, that transactions in the history of the Church are to be contemplated with different feelings from those which are naturally excited by the course of events in the history of a merely civil community. Whatever anxiety we may feel for the safety or well-being of the Church, should be tempered by the remembrance of its origin and its destination, of its character and its Author: of the foundation on which He has built it, and of the privileges and promises with which He has endowed it. It is true, that, by the appointment of Divine Providence, the prosperity of the Church is made to depend, in a very great degree, on the conduct of her individual members: on their faithfulness and earnestness, their activity and discretion; that whatever station they occupy, their sins, and even their errors, can never be altogether harmless, and are often attended with calamitous consequences to the whole body. That is a motive, more particularly urgent upon us as ministers of the Church, for unremitting vigilance and assiduity in the discharge of our allotted duties. But so long as we are conscious of a sincere desire to fulfil them, and are likewise convinced that the Church in whose cause we labour, possesses in her essential character a sure pledge of the Divine protection and blessing, no event can befall her, however seemingly disastrous and alarming, which should be allowed to cast down our spirits, or to shake our confidence; none which ought not rather to stimulate us to increased exertions, in the hope of seeing it overruled for the general good.

The Rubric, and the celebration of Public Worship.

Before I enter upon the topics relating to the immediate sphere of our ministerial duties to which I propose to call your attention, I feel it necessary to advert to some of those questions connected with the more general interests of the Church, which have of late been agitated with such extraordinary vehemence. And, first, I would make a few remarks on the disputes which have taken place, and have not yet been completely set at rest, with regard to the observance of the Rubric, and the celebration of public worship: the subject to which you will all have understood me to allude as that which very recently disturbed the peace of the Church.

I must premise, that when the excitement caused by these disputes was at its height, I was not one of those who regarded it as matter for serious alarm; perhaps because I viewed it from a distance, seeing that it had not interrupted the tranquillity of my own diocese; but the fact that it was thus partial, and indeed confined almost exclusively to two dioceses, seemed a just reason for hoping that it would prove only temporary; and this hope was confirmed by the observation, that where it was most violent, it was apparently least natural and spontaneous, and might be most clearly traced to an impulse received from without. Nor could I be easily persuaded, that divisions, arising upon points confessedly of so very slight intrinsic moment, were likely in our day to be widened into a deep and permanent breach of unity. But though, for these reasons, I conceived that the importance of this ferment had been much exaggerated, I did not view it with indifference, as if it were in its own nature utterly insignificant, or might not, if it were to be neglected, or aggravated by injudicious treatment, lead to very serious and unhappy consequences. The subject undoubtedly presents a great variety of aspects, and hence it has been contemplated by different persons with widely different feelings. But even those who have most warmly sympathised with the resistance which has been offered to the introduction of changes in the services of the Church, have scarcely been able to look upon it with unqualified approbation, and with unalloyed satisfaction; while, on the other hand, those who thought most favourably of those changes would probably have hesitated to condemn the opposition which they encountered, as either merely capricious and unreasonable, or as in all cases proceeding from bad motives. There has been, I think, something to censure, and much to regret, in that opposition; but yet it cannot fairly be denied, that, in most cases, if not in all, it arose from right feelings, and that it has produced some beneficial effects.

Importance of the question exaggerated.

It is clearly impossible rightly to estimate this recent excitement, without a reference to the previous movement in the Church, of which I spoke at some length in my last Charge. It is evident

that at least to some extent they stand to one another in the relation of cause and effect. The one has been very frequently put forward as a plea to justify the other; and it would be uncharitable to suppose that it has been merely employed as a pretext, with the distinct consciousness of different motives which were felt to be less honourable; but we may be permitted to believe that it has often contributed, but in a slight degree, to strengthen a repugnance which arose mainly from other causes. I am not going to discuss the character of that movement afresh; but it is fit to state, that I see no reason for recalling or changing any opinion I expressed with regard to it on the former occasion. I am aware that, in the judgment of some persons, subsequent events and publications have thrown a strong additional light on the subject; exhibiting, in the most unequivocal form, the tendency to Romanism, which had before been less plainly indicated. I cannot however draw any such inference from the facts, or treat the errors and extravagances of a few individuals, or a very small party, as evidence of the nature or the tendency of any principles which they hold in common with a large portion of the clergy. It does not seem to me a sufficient ground for such a conclusion, to show that Romanism is the extreme into which those who hold such principles are most likely to fall; nor that those principles have been the starting-point from which persons who have abandoned our communion for that of Rome, set out on the course of inquiry which led to that issue. The question is, whether distinctive Romish doctrines are logically involved in those principles. And this is a proposition neither so manifestly true, nor of so little importance, as to be admitted on a bare assertion. It is denied by the ablest and most learned advocates of those principles;* and I do not think that it is warranted by the examples which have been most confidently appealed to, as furnishing irresistible evidence in support of it. On the contrary, it seems to me clear, that in these cases, so far as we have means of judging,

Romanism not the necessary result of the Oxford movement.

* See "A Narrative of Events, connected with the publication of the 'Tracts for the Times,'" by the Rev. William Palmer, of Worcester College, Oxford, p. 46.

the conversion to Romanism was not the result of any logical process, but of moral and imaginative associations, and trains of feeling, quite independent of the principles in question. Still less has anything occurred that affords reasonable grounds for denying that the clergy, as a body, with exceptions quite inconsiderable in point of number, and with varieties of opinion on subordinate points not greater than have heretofore existed, and must be expected and even desired to exist in such a body, are sincerely attached to the genuine doctrines and system of our Church. The assertion that the fact is otherwise is indeed so useful to the adversaries of the Church, that it cannot surprise us to see it often advanced or insinuated. But the friends of the Church will, of course, require some stronger proof before they adopt a supposition so painful and so extraordinary; and they will beware that they do not, in the heat of controversy, suffer language to escape them which might seem to countenance it. And it was on this account that I wished to state my conviction on this head at the outset, so as to guard against the danger of being misinterpreted in the remarks which I have now to add on the other side of the subject.

Recent aspect of the movement.

For while I express this confidence in the spirit which pervades the great bulk of our brethren in the ministry, I do not wish to dissemble, what it would be vain to deny, that within the last few years much has occurred to arouse suspicion and distrust toward them in the minds of our people. In my last Charge, I was led to animadvert on some of the occasions of offence which had then been given by recent publications, put forth by clergymen, in which propositions were maintained, and language used, breathing disaffection to our Church, and apparently indicating a wish and a design of altering its character into a close conformity with that of Rome, and of entirely undoing the work of the Reformation amongst us. Since then we have witnessed occurrences still more surprising and alarming. We have seen ministers of the Church of England publicly avowing their assent to all the doctrines of the Church of Rome, and asserting the consistency of this belief, not only with the character with which they were invested at their ordination, but with the

continued exercise of their ministerial functions. This assertion was calculated to excite so much the more alarm, the less reason there was for questioning the sincerity with which it was made; because it seemed to prove that an ordinary degree of uprightness and reverence for truth is not sufficient security against this delusion. Aud still more recently, in a theological publication conducted by clergymen, and professing large views, entire impartiality, and warm attachment to our Church, I find this paradox treated as a probable opinion.* On the opinion itself I shall not now stop to comment. But I cannot refrain from making a few remarks on one feature which seems to me especially to deserve attention in the system adopted by the leading writers of this party. It might perhaps have been expected, from persons who had been brought up in our communion, and had even entered our ministry, that if, from whatever causes, they afterwards became converts to Romanism, they would have preferred that form of Romanism, which was least at variance with their previous associations and habits of thought: that on points as to which differences of opinion existed among Romanists themselves, they would have sided with the more moderate party; that their sympathies would have been in favour of Bossuet and Pascal, rather than of the schools which have carried the doctrine of the Papal supremacy to the most extravagant length, and have most strenuously upheld what we are used to consider as the grossest corruptions of the Church of Rome. The reverse however has in this instance been the case.† These modern proselytes to Romanism, even while they remain within our pale, and minister at our altars, have rushed into an extreme, from which many of the most sincere, pious, and enlightened members of that communion have shrunk. It seems as if no saying was too hard for them to hear, when it is Rome that speaks; that

Extreme position of modern proselytes to Romanism.

* *The Theologian*, No. VI., p. 294. "Should it turn out that the Romanising position is as tenable for a clergyman as we are satisfied it is for a layman, then, we trust, our readers will encourage those who occupy it in their continuance among us."

† "We can have no sympathy with the Gallican party, so far as it is at issue with the Ultra-montane." *British Critic*, No. LX. pp. 465.

there are no terms of communion which they are not ready to accept, if it is Rome that imposes them. The latest novelties recommended by this sanction are in their eyes as sacred as any portion of primitive doctrine. And if appeal be made to Scripture, or to ecclesiastical history, in proof of the recent origin of the dogmas they have embraced, it is silenced by a theory borrowed from modern Romish controversialists, and designated, by an ambiguous yet specious title, as the doctrine of *development*. The adoption of this theory is so characteristic of the party which has attempted to introduce it among us, that a few words on this point, itself one of no slight importance, will not be foreign to my immediate object.*

The doctrine of Development.

The term *development* obviously admits of several distinct significations. There is a physical development, as of the plant or the animal, with which we have here no concern, except as it may serve the purpose of illustration; and for that it may be useful to remember, that in this sense there may be a healthy or a morbid development, and that the term properly includes, not only the period of growth and increasing vigour, but every transformation which the subject undergoes

* See the passages quoted in Mr. Palmer's Narrative, pp. 63, 64, where he adds: "In private society the doctrine of development is more openly advocated, and carried out to its results. There are individuals who, on this principle, look on the Papal supremacy, the invocation of Saints, &c. as divinely instituted." He had previously observed, (p. 63,) "The theory of development has been repeatedly put forth in the *British Critic* within the last two years, though not to its full extent. The works of Möhler indeed, and De Maistre, in which it is employed in defence of Romanism, are favourite authorities with this periodical." It must not however be inferred that the two writers here named are of the same stamp with one another. Möhler is solidly learned, thoughtful, logical, and apparently willing to do justice to his opponents. At least, he is not in the habit of substituting peremptory and paradoxical assertions, or sneers, in the room of argument, nor capable (like De Maistre, in his work, "Du Pape") of grounding his reasoning on a total misconception of the point in dispute. His work on the Unity of the Church contains much that is true and valuable; and perhaps Mr. Newman's remark, in the note, p. 321 of his "Sermons preached before the University," "The Controversy between our own Church and the Church of Rome lies, it is presumed, *in the matter of fact*, whether such and such developments are true (e.g. Purgatory a true development of the doctrine of sin after baptism), not in the *principle* of development itself"—which otherwise requires much qualification—might be safely admitted with regard to Möhler's statements. But that such a writer as De Maistre should be a *favourite authority* with any divines, would of itself be a sufficient reason for applying to them the remarks in the text.

according to the laws of its nature, down to the last stage of decomposition. There is also an intellectual development, by which conclusions are deduced from the premises in which they are involved, or general laws applied to particular cases; as when the precepts of the decalogue are expanded into a complete code of morals. And here, if the method be legitimate, and be correctly employed, the result will certainly be true and right.

Historical Development.

But there is likewise a historical development, such as is constantly taking place in the condition and the institutions of every human society; for none can ever remain perfectly stationary, but is continually undergoing a more or less perceptible change. Now it is evident, that if a question should be raised as to the quality of an institution, or of a social condition, with a view to determine the estimation in which it should be held, and the manner in which it should be dealt with, it would not be enough to show that it had arisen gradually out of an earlier one, which is admitted to have been good and wholesome. For there is no abuse, or social evil, that might not be defended on that ground. Yet it is in this sense that the term has been recently applied to vindicate doctrines and practices of the Church of Rome, against which we protest as unauthorised innovations. And undoubtedly there is not one of them that may not be described as a development, that is, as historically derived from an earlier state of things, from tenets or usages of primitive times: as the adoration of relics and the invocation of saints may be traced to the veneration paid to the martyrs, and the custom of commemorating their deaths. But it is clear, that there is only one supposition on which this fact can be of the slightest avail to establish the soundness of any Romish doctrine or practice: that is, if it be assumed, in contradiction to our nineteenth Article, that the Church of Rome has never erred, and that it is protected by Divine interposition from the possibility of error, in matters of faith. And this is in fact the assumption which lies at the root of the theory. On this supposition it is of course superfluous to refer to Scripture, or even to tradition, in defence of any controverted tenet; and it is

How applied to establish Romish doctrine.

erroneous to appeal to them against it. All that is requisite is to show that it is actually held by the Church of Rome. The creed of Pius IV. is equally entitled to assent with that of the Apostles, even though admitted to contain doctrines which were unknown to them. The Church is thus invested with a new office and prerogative: she is not only the keeper and expounder of divine truth, but is empowered to reveal it: she not only declares, but makes articles of faith. This theory is of recent date even in the Church of Rome; it virtually renounces the position which her apologists had previously thought it necessary to maintain; and it seems to have been embraced only by a few speculative writers among them. Yet it has been adopted without hesitation by divines of our own Church. There can hardly be a clearer sign, that it has not been by a process of legitimate reasoning, nor by a spirit of earnest and sober inquiry, nor with a single eye to truth as the object of their researches, that they have been brought to their conclusion.

Resistance on the part of the laity to the movement.

In one point of view perhaps we have reason to rejoice at the exhibition of temerity, extravagance, and sophistry, which appears in the writings designed to inculcate such principles; because it must lessen the danger of contagion. In unprejudiced, unsophisticated, intelligent minds, it could not fail to excite disgust and indignation; and there can be no doubt that such were the feelings, blended with suspicion and alarm, with which it was viewed by the great mass of the laity who took an interest in the subject. Their number was considerable; and those who had not access to the works themselves, might receive information concerning them through a variety of channels, which were not likely to convey too favourable an impression of their character. The excitement thus aroused was aggravated, while it was more widely diffused by the unguarded language and indiscreet conduct of many clergymen, who, though not sharing the views of the party just described, did not carefully abstain from expressions which seemed to favour them, and introduced innovations into the celebration of public worship, which were at least popularly connected with them, as

approximating, in part, either to particular observances, or to the general character, of the Roman ritual. Under these circumstances it was not surprising that the feeling thus provoked should display itself in a determined resistance to all changes of this kind. And considered simply in this light, and apart from the objects against which it was immediately and ostensibly pointed, this reaction might well be hailed with pleasure by friends of the Church, as a manifestation of Protestant feeling, though they might not in all cases approve of the manner in which it was carried on, and might regret many of its visible or probable consequences.

The ground on which the changes are defended.

But whether the changes proposed were desirable in themselves is quite a distinct question, not at all depending on the causes of the resistance offered to them. They would not deserve to be condemned simply because, having been introduced at an unseasonable juncture, they happened to shock and irritate a natural and commendable feeling; as, on the other hand, it would not be a conclusive proof of their intrinsic worth, if it were certain that they had incurred dislike, chiefly because they added a little to the length of the service, or multiplied the ordinary appeals to the charity of the congregation. The ground however on which they were defended, was, as you are aware, not that they were in themselves preferable to the usage for which they were substituted, but simply that they were a revival of observances which had been originally enjoined by a competent authority, had been dropped without either necessity or sufficient reason, and were therefore still binding on every clergyman, as a part of the engagement which he had solemnly contracted at his ordination, and from which no authority inferior to that by which it was imposed could release him.

The Rubric must be obeyed.

According to this view, a conscientious minister, having once ascertained the sense of the Rubric, must feel that no option is left to him; he is not at liberty to exercise his own private judgment as to its fitness or expediency, or to let himself be governed by that of others. The only question that it is allowable to raise on the subject, must relate to the

interpretation of the law, not to its claims on his obedience. And even as to the true meaning of the Rubric, questions did arise of no little intricacy and difficulty, so as to divide the opinions of intelligent and well-informed inquirers. Any discussion of such questions would, I think, on this occasion only occupy time, which might be more usefully employed; and I shall therefore abstain from touching on them. But with regard to the alleged obligation of reviving obsolete rites, which are clearly prescribed by the Rubric, I must say a few words. It would have been unreasonable to expect that regulations of this kind should be exempt from the ordinary condition of all human institutions, and not liable, in the course of time, to become a dead letter; and when this is the case, one who treats them as such is at least chargeable with no breach of duty which is not shared by the whole Church. And undoubtedly, if the Church had the power of revising her ordinances as often as might be deemed requisite, she could hardly be acquitted of a culpable supineness if she suffered such a state of things to remain; while, on the other hand, there might be a question how her silence should be construed: whether as sanctioning what she did not expressly forbid, or as retaining in force what she did not formally abolish. But the case is widely different when the Church has been divested of that power, and can neither make new laws nor change old ones. There is then, clearly, much stronger reason for doubting whether the letter of her ancient enactments is still a true exponent of her present mind and will; and it does not seem a violent construction, to regard the prevailing practice as supplying the place of a declaration which she is unable to make through her proper organs. Still, though this consideration may be sufficient to vindicate the consistency of those clergymen who have thought themselves at liberty to depart from the letter of the Rubric, where it was at variance with the received usage, it cannot be pronounced so decisive, that the scruples professed by others, who would adhere as closely as possible to the written rule, may be fairly disregarded as either affected or frivolous; though we may be permitted to

Revival of obsolete Rites.

doubt whether such scruples have been often felt by persons who did not consider the revival of the old observance as desirable in itself. But this is not even a reason for questioning the sincerity of those scruples; still less can it prove that they have no solid ground to rest upon. And it cannot be denied that, if sincere, they are entitled to respect, nor that in too many cases they have been uncharitably judged, and harshly treated. Nor is it easy to understand on what principle persons who had been led by their horror of any approach to Romanism, to conceive such distrust of their pastors, could, nevertheless, after the concession of a few points, confessedly indifferent and unimportant in themselves, recover their tranquillity, and acquiesce in the continued ministrations of those whom they had recently regarded with suspicion, though, had they ever been unfaithful to their trust, they had just the same means of abusing it as before. It would however be vain to expect that persons acting under the influence of strongly excited feelings should regulate their conduct with perfect consistency. And it may be hoped that these disputes, painful as they have been, will not have left any deep or permanent traces behind them, and that they should be considered less as a cause of alienation between the ministers and their people, than as an indication of something defective in the terms on which they had previously stood to one another. On the other hand, there is at least one benefit which may be expected to result from them, and which, though somewhat dearly purchased, is of considerable value. There is no room to apprehend that they will have shaken any one's attachment to any portion of truth which he had clearly perceived and earnestly embraced; but they may probably have served as a wholesome check to a propensity which, as I have already intimated, appeared to be gaining ground among some of the clergy, towards indulging in exaggerated language and indiscreet practices, in the ostentation of singularity, or an affected conformity to some favourite models, not the result of serious conviction, but a superficial imitation, displaying itself in things which, if not wholly unmeaning, were calculated to give just offence.

In a happier and healthier state of the Church, one in which

she was at liberty to deliberate and decide on matters most deeply affecting her spiritual interests, and might safely exercise her right, such a difference of opinion as we have lately witnessed on the subjects I have been speaking of would, if it could have arisen at all, have been probably attended with another still more important advantage. It can hardly be doubted, that it would have given occasion for a comprehensive and exact review of our ritual, for the purpose, not merely of terminating disputes on ambiguous points by an authoritative declaration, but likewise of correcting anomalies, retrenching superfluities, supplying defects, and in a word, of applying the results of her gathered experience, and her collective wisdom, to remove every blemish, and to adapt the whole as much as possible to her present condition, and the actual wants of her children; such, I say, would probably have been the issue of these disputes in better times. The unhappiness of our own in this respect is twofold. We have to lament that the Church is still restrained from holding her periodical assemblies for any purpose of serious consultation, and even that much has occurred of late to render them an object of increased jealousy to the civil power, and thus to throw fresh hindrance in the way of their revival. The other and greater evil is, that, even were they now restored, the temper of our times is such, as to make it very doubtful whether they could be yet beneficially or safely set in action. And those who are most anxious for a revision of the Liturgy, would perhaps most earnestly deprecate the attempting such a work at a time when the events which seem most clearly to show the need of it, have called up a spirit of party, which would almost inevitably take possession of it, and strive to mould it to its own ends. But if the possibility of this danger may be allowed in some measure to console us under a privation which is very generally felt to be both degrading and injurious to the Church, it ought not to make us insensible or indifferent to the importance of the benefit which would be likely to accrue from that work, if undertaken and conducted in a right spirit. We are not bound to shut our eyes to the need that exists for it, because it is our duty

A review of the ritual of the Church to be desired.

The evils which prevent such revision.

for the present patiently to submit to the want of it. We must suspect that the persons who have resisted all attempts at change, on the plea that our Liturgy is absolutely perfect, are, if sincere, very unenlightened and injudicious friends of the Church. Nor is it true, as has been ignorantly or insidiously alleged, that the clergy have set up any such extravagant pretensions in its behalf. On the contrary, that large body of them, including a great majority of the whole, who, about eleven years ago, thought proper to make a solemn joint declaration of their *devoted adherence to the doctrine and polity of the Church, and their deep-rooted attachment to her Liturgy, earnestly deprecating rash innovation in spiritual matters*, nevertheless in the same document disclosed their consciousness that, *from the lapse of years or altered circumstances*, some things pertaining to such matters might *require renewal or correction*, and expressed their willingness to co-operate with the rulers of the Church in carrying into effect any measures tending to supply that want, should it appear to exist. And no reasonable man can contend that there is the slightest inconsistency between such an admission, even if extended beyond a bare possibility, to the actual need of amendment, with the previous professions. Rather there would have been reason for doubting the sincerity of those professions, if they had not been accompanied by such an admission. We may very well maintain that our Liturgy is excellent in its parts, and good even as a whole, that is, better suited than any other we know of to the purpose of public devotion, and affording no ground or fair excuse for separation; and yet believe it capable of some important improvements, and earnestly desire that it should receive them.*

The Liturgy not to be regarded as perfect.

And this suggests another remark, with which I shall quit the

* "If I were to be asked what my own opinion is as to the expediency of attempting any alteration in the Liturgy, I should be deficient in candour if I did not acknowledge that I think the Liturgy capable of improvement. It would be little short of a miracle were it otherwise; and I know not why I should be ashamed or reluctant to avow an opinion which was entertained by Sancroft, and Stillingfleet, and Tenison, and Wake, and Secker, and Porteus. I heartily pray a season may come when the question may be looked at with calmness and candour."—Bishop of London's Charge, 1834, pp. 40, 41.

subject, and to which I would bespeak your especial attention, as more nearly concerning ourselves. The disputes as to the observance of the Rubric, by which the Church has been lately agitated, have turned mainly on two points: on the correct interpretation of the letter, and on the obligation of an exact compliance with it. But where the sense is clearly ascertained, the only ground on which that obligation has been questioned is, that the literal rule might properly be considered as superseded by the generally received practice. But no party or person, so far as I know, has ventured to contend, that any clergyman is at liberty to depart both from the letter and from the received usage, and to make his own private taste, judgment, or convenience, the rule of his observance. I cannot but fear that in some parts of this Diocese there has prevailed on this head a degree of laxity, which elsewhere all parties, however divided in opinion on other things, would agree to condemn. And I find that the remarks which I have made on it in my last Charge, have excited great surprise in other parts of the Church, as disclosing a state of things, which persons accustomed to the ordinary regularity of our services had not imagined to exist anywhere. It is to be feared that some have reconciled themselves to such laxity under an impression that the matters on which they exercised their discretion were of little importance, forgetting that whether of great or little moment in themselves, they derive a weight from their connection with a solemn engagement, which renders it impossible for a conscientious and thoughtful minister of our Church to view them with indifference. I am aware that there are peculiar local circumstances which may be thought to furnish an excuse for such irregularity. But where there is need of excuse, there is evidently something that requires amendment. And though happily our tranquillity has not been disturbed by the recent excitement, I would hope that it will not have subsided without having awakened among us a greater degree of attention to subjects so intimately connected with our official duties, and which have elsewhere given rise to

The observance of the Rubric: points on which the dispute turns.

Common neglect of Church Order in the Diocese.

much earnest controversy among our brethren. It cannot be said that they are all matters of merely conventional importance, wholly indifferent in their own nature. I am not much inclined to exaggerate the value of uniformity. I am aware that it may be enforced too rigidly, and carried too far into detail. Thus I do not deeply regret that you should not all wear the same kind of vestment in the pulpit. I rather think it fortunate that so many of you have been able, from your own experience, to estimate the correctness of the notion, that the surplice in that place becomes a badge of Popery; though if any principle can be discovered, clear enough to command universal assent, on which one form or colour of the preacher's habiliment is to be preferred to another, the sooner that discovery is made public, the better. So again, I should be very sorry to see a regulation enacted, requiring you all to address your congregations from written discourses; and I should think it a still greater misfortune if you were forbidden to do so. But I lament very much that there should be so great a want of uniformity, as is disclosed by your answers to my Queries, with regard to the practice of collecting at the Offertory, and that there are so many parishes in the Diocese where no collection is ever made at the celebration of the Holy Communion. There has indeed been much controversy as to the propriety of making such collections at other times, and as to the purposes to which they may be lawfully applied. And I cannot help observing on the last of these questions, that if there were a law restricting the application to one class of objects, I should earnestly desire to see that restriction immediately abolished. But that no opportunity should be offered even to those who are about to partake of the Holy Communion, to exercise the charitable disposition which is implied in a worthy reception of the Sacrament, according to the direction of the Rubric, seems to me an omission no less indefensible in itself, than it is happily at variance with the prevailing practice of the Church. I cannot admit that the general poverty of the parishioners is a sufficient plea for such an omission. It cannot prevent any one from being merciful after his power; and

Use of the Surplice.

Collections at the Offertory.

the richest can do no more. And we know that in the balance of the sanctuary the value of the offering is not measured by its amount. I should indeed be glad to believe that these collections had anywhere become superfluous, either because the spirit of charity and self-denial is already sufficiently active, or because there is no longer any indigence to call for relief. But so happy a state of things has as yet not fallen under my own observation.

The Grant to Maynooth.

I now pass to another subject, which has still more recently excited a yet livelier interest in the public mind, though not exclusively, nor even chiefly, within our own communion, I mean the measure passed in the last session of Parliament for increasing and rendering permanent the grant which had previously been renewed from year to year, for the support of the Roman Catholic College at Maynooth. I should not have thought it necessary to say a word to vindicate the propriety of bringing this subject before you on the present occasion, but that I have seen it suggested that the question, being a political one, is not suited to this place, nor connected with the purposes for which we are here assembled. This suggestion however has proceeded from persons, who had previously thought it quite consistent with this opinion to contend strenuously against the measure on purely religious grounds; and indeed it seems to imply a strange thoughtlessness to hold, that, because it is a political question, it is therefore at all the less a moral and religious one. A political question it undoubtedly is, so far as it relates to a measure which is admitted on all hands deeply to affect the common weal, for good or for evil; but when a doubt is raised whether the measure is consistent with those principles of religion and morality by which we profess to regulate our conduct, the question manifestly becomes a moral and religious one; and it will claim our attention in this point of view the more forcibly in proportion to its political importance. All therefore that I feel to be incumbent on me is, to confine myself on this occasion to its moral and religious bearings.

A political and religious question.

The excitement which has been produced by this subject has, as I have already intimated, been more perceptible elsewhere than

within our own communion. Of the clergy, comparatively few appear to have contributed to it, or to have shared it; though it is impossible to infer the opinion of any of them from their silence. But if I had more reason than I have to apprehend that the greater part of those I am addressing took a different view of the question from myself, I should only feel the more strongly induced to make a few remarks upon it. But I need hardly say, that I neither expect nor desire to influence the opinions of others in any other way than that in which my own have been formed. If I am in error on this head, I certainly cannot plead, as may possibly be the case with some of those who hear me, that I have not enjoyed sufficient opportunities of making myself acquainted with the opposite side of the subject; but I can truly say, that I have not neglected to avail myself of any means I possessed of arriving at the truth. It has happened however, that the impression left upon my mind by the most elaborate arguments that have fallen in my way on that side, has been a feeling of disappointment and of surprise; not at their weakness, but at the direction in which they were aimed, which seemed to me, as if instinctively, to keep clear of the points on which the real merits of the question turned. And I could not help observing, though without any surprise, that this obliquity of reasoning was commonly combined with proportionate vehemence of language, often carried beyond all bounds of sobriety, decency, and charity. I know it may be said, that the obliquity I complain of exists not in the object to which I refer it, but simply in my own vision. But it is at least evident, that on one side or the other there is some great misunderstanding with regard to a matter of the deepest importance. And therefore I feel it to be a duty, the discharge of which well befits the sanctity of this place and the solemnity of the occasion, to endeavour to contribute toward the illustration of the truth, if it be only by affording to others an opportunity of detecting and exposing my own error.

Opinions of the Clergy not generally expressed.

I am aware that the case is one which may raise several considerable difficulties in theory. It is a high question of political

ethics to determine the duty of the State, or governing body, toward its subjects, as to their religious concerns, when, as in our own empire, they are divided into a number of societies, separated from each other by religious differences. There are two opposite extremes of opinion on this head, which have perhaps found the more favour because each is recommended by an appearance of simplicity, and seems to save the trouble of farther investigation. According to one of these opinions, the State best fulfils its duty if it observes a strict neutrality, and takes care, whatever may be the sentiments of the persons who compose the governing body, in their private capacity, not to betray any preference of one religious persuasion to another. According to the opposite opinion, the duty of the State, though widely different, is equally simple; it is to favour one religion, and one only; namely, that which the persons exercising the powers of government, who are supposed to be unanimous in their own religious belief, hold to be the true one; and the individual statesman is no more at liberty in his public character to afford countenance or support to any other, than he is in the use of his private means. I look upon these two extremes as equally erroneous, and I will not pronounce which is the more mischievous. The proposition, that anything which exercises such a powerful influence on the habits, character, and condition of a nation as religion, may be viewed with indifference by its rulers, appears to me an extravagant paradox; and a person who should profess that he can discover no ground for preferring one form of religion to another, seems only to betray his own deficiency in the most essential qualifications of a statesman. But it is not necessary that those who reject this opinion should rush into the opposite extreme. It seems to me another equally outrageous paradox to affirm—having once admitted that it is the duty of the State to provide for the religious wants of its subjects—that, in a deliberation on the mode in which the public resources are to be applied to that purpose, their religious convictions are not to be taken into account, or are only to be regarded as an additional

Duty of the State towards different religious bodies.

The State cannot observe a strict neutrality.

Nor ought it to favour one religion only.

motive for adopting a course directly counter to their feelings and wishes. On this theory, an absolute sovereign, who dissented from the religion of his people, would be bound to deprive them of all religious instruction, and all means of public worship, supplied by funds subject to his control, and, if his authority extended far enough, to prohibit such an appropriation of their private fortunes. For this would only be a consistent application of the same principle, and an abuse of power, though perhaps more galling, not intrinsically more unjust. It would not imply a greater disregard of the sacredness of religious convictions, however erroneous, nor a grosser ignorance or forgetfulness of the duties of his station, and of the rightful claims of his subjects to a share in the distribution of the public patrimony entrusted to his care. We may indeed conceive an upright and intelligent man, placed in such a situation, reconciling his conscience to such measures for a time, by the hope of being able to substitute his own religion for that which he found prevailing among his people. But when he had discovered that this exceeded his power, that by the attempts which he made for that purpose, he could thwart, annoy, and irritate his subjects, but could not convert them: then, if his zeal was far stronger than his judgment, he would, perhaps, resign his painful functions; but if he was an enlightened, as well as a sincere friend of pure religion, he would not scruple to retain them, and to wield his power, and dispense the public property conformably to the exigencies of the case, and to the wants and desires of his people, as God's minister to them for good, in the manner apparently ordained by Providence, though it might be one very different from that which he would have chosen, if his views and wishes had been seconded by omnipotence.

Truth and justice may require the support of an erroneous religion.

Such I believe to be the conclusion which would have resulted from the most accurate investigation of the subject on the soundest general principles. It would appear that, as is commonly the case, the line of truth and justice lies somewhere between the two opposite extremes; though it may not be easy to frame a rule by

which it may always infallibly be found: that there are circumstances in which it becomes the duty of the State, and of the individual statesman in his public capacity, to act ministerially for the maintenance of a religion which is opposed in the most essential points to his personal, avowed, and most deeply rooted convictions. Practically, this is the conclusion at which the State had arrived, and which it had acted upon repeatedly in the government of our empire, before the question we are now considering had arisen. It was, of course, not by any process of philosophical inquiry, but by that intuitive good sense, which often supplies us with a surer guidance, that we were brought to this decision. But it has been sanctioned by at least a tacit acquiescence, as full and unqualified as ever accompanied any public measure; nor has the principle in other instances been accounted at all inconsistent with that which has been so firmly established by constitution, in opposition to that of religious neutrality—the right and duty of showing a decided preference of a particular form of Christianity over every other religion. Even now the persons who most earnestly deprecated the recent application of this principle in the grant to the College of Maynooth, have neither ventured to reprobate the policy which adopted it in the preceding cases, nor been able to point out any distinction of principle between those cases and this. In their attempts to do so, they seem to have been betrayed into a temporary forgetfulness of the first elements of moral truth, and have reasoned as if it was allowable to contribute toward the maintenance of the Roman Catholic religion abroad, with a view to the aggrandisement of the empire, but not to do the same thing at home, for the sake of promoting the tranquillity of Ireland. So that the case, which, on account of its peculiar circumstances and its incalculable importance, might have seemed to furnish an allowable exception to the rule, had it been observed in every other, would be the only one in which we are not at liberty to neglect it. Such inconsistency may be overlooked in the warmth of discussion, but it will not escape the notice of those whose interests and feelings it deeply affects; and they will be slow to credit the sincerity of

Inconsistency of those who oppose the Grant.

scruples, which they perceive to be so flexible toward the rest of the world, and only unbending when wielded against them.

For us, my brethren, who are all agreed on the main point, that it is the duty of the State to provide, as far as may be, not only for the intellectual, but for the moral and religious improvement of the people, the question seems to lie within a very narrow compass. On what ground can we justly withhold a share in this benefit from six or seven millions of our Irish fellow-subjects of the Roman Catholic persuasion? The only ground that any of us could assign would be, of course, that he believes their religion to be an erroneous one. But no one, it may be presumed, will assert that their error is a crime, for which they deserve to be punished by privation of all religious learning, help, and comfort. The ground then must be, that the quality of their religious error is such as to render the only kind of teaching which they will consent to receive, namely, that of their own clergy, an evil instead of a benefit: something therefore which it is not cruelty, but charity, to withhold from them. And this is, in fact, the ground which has been taken by the opponents of the grant to the College of Maynooth. It has been sometimes expressed in the form: *I will not be a party to the teaching of that which I believe to be error:* a sentiment to which it is impossible not to assent in the abstract, and which may look like a strong argument, until the terms are examined, and compared with the facts of the case to which it is applied. But as soon as we have done so, we perceive that what is called *error* in this case, is a complicated system of doctrine, in which truth and error are combined and blended together. Others may question this; but we, my brethren, cannot deny it, without rejecting our Bible, our Creeds, our Liturgy, and our Articles. We may, if we will, fix our attention not on that which is true, but exclusively on that which is false, in this system; but we cannot deny the existence of truth in it without renouncing our own faith. Then again we find that what, for the sake of giving a colour to the objection, has been invidiously termed *teaching*, is, in fact, a totally different thing,

The religion may be erroneous, but error is not a crime.

The argument based on the encouragement given to the teaching of error.

namely, the suffering this erroneous doctrine to be taught at the expense of the State, and that precisely because we do not teach, and the prejudices of the people put it out of our power to teach, that which is purer and sounder; because, for the purpose of teaching, there must be not only teachers, but also learners. And so, when this specious sentiment is brought nearer to the light, it turns out to be a rhetorical sophism, only so far true as it is utterly inapplicable to the circumstances of the case: *I will never consent to teach that which I believe to be error.* Certainly that is a maxim which all of us are bound steadfastly to observe, I in this chair, and each of you in his pulpit, or wherever else we have an opportunity of expressing our opinion, and communicating instruction. We are bound to teach nothing but what we believe to be pure unadulterated truth. We are not at liberty knowingly to propagate even the slightest and seemingly most harmless error. But the case is evidently entirely different, when it is not we who are to teach, but others, over whom we have no control, and when the point on which we are to decide is, whether we will let that imperfect and erroneous religion be taught; or there shall, so far as we are able to prevent it, be no religious teaching at all. In other words, are we prepared to affirm, that the error which is mixed up with the truth in the Roman Catholic doctrine so vitiates the whole, that it would be better for the people of Ireland to be left entirely destitute of all religious education than to be brought up in that system? I am happy to be able to say, that I am not aware of any one, even in the heat of the recent excitement, having, either in speech or writing, avowed such an opinion. I have indeed not unfrequently met with arguments and illustrations which implied that opinion, and which, unless it was assumed, were utterly futile and irrelevant; as when, for instance, the case of the Roman Catholic population of Ireland is compared to that of a patient who rejects the medicine that is good for him; when it would be absurd to say that he should be allowed to take a medicine that will do him harm, rather than none at all. But it would not be absurd to

Are we to refuse all religious education to Roman Catholics?

say, that if the patient's stomach rejected one kind of food, he should be allowed to take some other kind of food, though less nutritive and wholesome, rather than to starve. Still, though many have reasoned as if they held that opinion, I rejoice to repeat I do not know the man who has ventured to avow it. But, whoever else may do so, I trust that we, my brethren, are too deeply impressed with the value of those truths which we hold in common with the Roman Catholic Church, to permit ourselves to entertain a thought which would imply that, in our judgment, these truths—the very foundations of our religion—are secondary and unessential. If however this be so, it is manifestly quite foreign to the purpose to inquire in what degree the Roman Catholic religion is a corrupt form of Christianity, or in what proportions the truth it contains is mixed with error. It may be very corrupt, very bad, as compared with our own; and yet, relatively to the wants and capacities of those who are to be instructed in it, it may be not only good, but the best; and therefore under circumstances such as those of Ireland, not only is it the duty of the State to provide such instruction, but it may often happen that an individual Protestant, most sincerely attached to his own faith, may feel himself bound to contribute out of his private means to the same object, in the conscientious discharge of the obligations which his property imposes on him toward his poor neighbours and dependants, because he finds that it is the only way in which he can promote their spiritual welfare.

Their own system may be the best for them.

And if this be true with regard to the Roman Catholic religion in general, it is equally so with regard to the education of the Roman Catholic clergy in the College of Maynooth. Much has been said and written to show that the instruction which the students receive there is not only bad, inasmuch as it inculcates Roman Catholic doctrines, but that it is much worse than, consistently with those doctrines, it need be; that it is, in fact, a corruption and exaggeration of a corrupt and perverse system. I do not mean now to inquire whether this is a correct representation

Applies to the education of the Roman Catholic clergy.

of the fact, but only to observe, that the persons who have laboured most strenuously to establish this point, seem all to have thought that when they had accomplished this, their argument was complete, and no room left for any further question. Yet there was one which remained behind, quite unnoticed, though of the greatest importance for the practical conclusion: the question, whether we have the means of reforming or amending that vicious system, of introducing a better course of study, of substituting sounder and more edifying works for the standards and class-books hitherto in use there. If this was in our power, we should undoubtedly have incurred the responsibility of every error that was permitted to remain. But, as far as I know, it has not even been suggested by any opponent of the grant, either that it might, by virtue of proper stipulations, have procured such alterations as we desired in the system of instruction adopted in the college, or that this effect would have ensued if it had been withheld. It is too notorious that the proposal of such stipulations would have been attended with worse consequences than the most peremptory refusal; and that a refusal would have left whatever evil existed in the theory of the system wholly untouched, while it would have greatly aggravated its practical mischiefs, by the irritation which would inevitably have followed the rejection of a reasonable request. We should have lost all the advantage we may expect from an act of justice and liberality, without the possibility of the slightest gain to the cause of truth.

The charge of idolatry brought against the Church of Rome.

Though however the quality of the distinctive tenets of the Roman Catholic religion appears to me, for the reasons I have assigned, to be totally foreign to the question, it may be worth while to notice one objection grounded on the peculiar character of that religion, which has been brought forward more prominently, and seems to have weighed more with many conscientious persons, than any other. Its other errors and corruptions they might perhaps have overlooked; but the imputation of idolatry, with which it is understood to stand solemnly charged, both by our Church and by the Legislature, has been felt to be so heinous,

that it is impossible for any one to consent to grant any favour to such a Church without partaking in its sin. I am unwilling to pass over the objection in silence, little as I myself attach any peculiar importance to it, partly because it has been conceived to be entitled to special attention from us, as ministers of the Church of England, who have virtually, if not expressly subscribed to that accusation; and partly because I believe that there is a misunderstanding very widely prevalent on this head, which it is highly desirable to clear up. Let me then briefly observe, that we may very consistently, and in various senses not improperly, apply the term *idolatrous* to certain practices authorized and enjoined by the Church of Rome, without meaning to affirm that Church to be guilty of a breach of the second commandment. When a member of our Church declares his conviction that the Romish service of the Mass is an idolatrous worship, he expresses his belief that the object of that worship is not what the Church of Rome teaches, but a mere material substance set apart for a sacred use; and it can hardly be said that he expresses this belief too strongly. But it would be the height of absurdity to charge one who believes in the doctrine of the Real Presence with idolatry, because he renders that worship which, with his belief, it would be impiety to withhold; or to maintain that a misinterpretation of Scripture as to the institution of the Eucharist is a sin of the same kind with a transgression of the second commandment. And yet I suspect that this is by no means an uncommon confusion of ideas, and therefore I must own I cannot but regret that a term which is so apt to create this confusion, and thus to inflame religious animosity, should ever be employed to express our dissent from the doctrine of Rome with regard to that sacrament. When again writers of our communion reprobate the kind of worship paid by the Church of Rome to the Virgin Mary and other Saints, and the Romish veneration of images and relics, as more or less partaking of the nature of idolatry, they do this on two grounds: first, that the worship, even when kept within the bounds prescribed by the doctrine of the Roman Church, is carried

A distinction to be observed.

The Service of the Mass.

The worship of the Virgin and Saints.

to an unwarrantable length, attributing to created beings powers and functions which we believe it has been the good pleasure of the Almighty to reserve to Himself; and next, on account of its tendency, as being calculated to lead the ignorant vulgar into the practice of actual idolatry, that is, into the habitual substitution of the creature, as the main object and centre of devotional feelings, in the room of the Creator. But no well-informed Protestant will contend, that the error into which the Church of Rome has fallen on these points, whether it have proceeded from a misconstruction of the language of Scripture, or a mistaken reliance on the authority of tradition, is a thing of the same nature with idolatry, or that any one is guilty of that sin who conscientiously worships according to that erroneous doctrine. On the other hand, the degree in which the practice of the vulgar in these particulars goes beyond the doctrine of their Church, can hardly ever be more than matter of surmise. But however strong may be the probability on which this suspicion is founded, though the supposed corruption of practice may afford good ground for questioning the judgment, the discretion, and the charity, of the rulers of the Church in which it is overlooked or connived at, it would be a violent exaggeration to represent such imprudence or negligence, however culpable, as a species of idolatry. And we should be perfectly consistent in our attachment to our own communion, and should not need to surrender any one of its principles, though we should be convinced that the Church of Rome is not an idolatrous Church, and should even indulge the charitable hope, that none of her members is guilty of the sin of idolatry, otherwise than as we must all acknowledge with shame, that we have not kept the second commandment, any more than any other, in its spiritual breadth and rigour, but have set up idols in our hearts, some perhaps worse than any images of wood and stone. I believe that the distinction which I have endeavoured to point out has been overlooked by many, who would have been glad to reconcile a firm adherence to their own faith, with a more lenient judgment on that of their Roman Catholic fellow-

The Church of Rome may be in error and yet not idolatrous.

This distinction has been overlooked.

Christians. And I am convinced that those of you, my brethren, who are most zealous against error, would never wish to condemn others any further than you thought it necessary for your own vindication, and for the assertion of the truth. And since it is certain that if idolatry, in the literal sense, exists in the Church of Rome, it is the effect of popular ignorance, it does not seem clear that a measure designed to give a more liberal education to the instructors of a Roman Catholic population, whatever may be its other demerits, is particularly open to the charge of promoting idolatry.

The Grant is an act of justice.

I have said that I regard this measure as an act of justice; and one who views it in that light, is not bound to calculate its consequences, nor at liberty to let them sway his decision. Even therefore if I thought I saw reason to apprehend that it might prove detrimental to the interests of the Protestant religion in Ireland, I should still feel obliged, though reluctantly, to approve of it. We may not do evil, that good may come; nor omit to do right, because harm seems likely to ensue. And if this be so when temporal interests are at stake, still less are we permitted to defend truth by wrong: least of all can we, without folly and impiety, think to serve the cause of the Most High by a transgression of His laws. Having done our duty, we may safely leave the event to His disposal, and calmly look for His blessing.

Not a conflict between duty and expediency.

But having said this, I must add, that the case does not to my mind present any such conflict between a clear duty, and probable expediency; that on the contrary one of the grounds on which I view this act of the Legislature with the deepest satisfaction is, that I believe it will be productive not of harm, but of much good, to the cause of pure religion, and to everything that we most love and value. And I build this hope not simply on the blessing of Providence, which we may humbly expect, but on the results of long experience, and on the laws of human nature itself. When I look back on the history of Ireland, I find that it has for a series of many generations been governed by a system of policy, to which I will not in this place apply the epithets which befit it, and of which I shall only speak with

reference to the effects it has produced on the interests of religion: a system however diametrically opposed in its spirit and tendency to the measure we are now considering. I see that one result of that system has been to associate the religion of our Church, in the minds of the great mass of the Irish population, with the ideas of injustice, tyranny, and cruelty, still more closely than the same ideas are connected in the minds of the people of England with the religion of Queen Mary. And not only has that system raised an almost insurmountable barrier to the reception of what we believe to be truth, by rousing the best feelings of human nature against it, and enlisting them in their utmost strength on the side of error: it has likewise intercepted and repelled whatever wholesome influence might otherwise have been exerted, by the exhibition of a purer religion, even on those who were not induced to embrace it. The misnamed Protestant ascendancy has established the predominance of the Roman Catholic religion in its worst form. A measure, then, standing in the most direct contrast to that calamitous system, must be admitted so far to raise a natural prepossession in its favour, as it does not seem likely that it should produce similar effects. It is at least a pledge that that system shall never be restored. It contributes something toward wiping away the disgrace which that system has brought upon our Church and nation in the eyes of civilized Europe. It tends to dissolve that unhappy association of ideas, by which our religion has been rendered odious to so large a body of our fellow-countrymen. And these are advantages which seem sufficient to recommend it to us as Churchmen, if we are to judge of it by considerations of expediency. They open indeed a prospect of ulterior consequences still more important and desirable; but which we can hardly venture to contemplate with more than a faint and tremulous hope. When we consider the disastrous effects of the system now happily abandoned, which so long counteracted the diffusion of Protestant principles in Ireland, we cannot be surprised if some think it impossible that the evil should ever be completely remedied, even by an opposite course of policy, and limit their

Justified by the history of the past.

A reversal of a mischievous policy.

Its probable results.

most sanguine expectations to the improvement which may be wrought by it in the character of the Roman Catholic religion itself. I do not mean either to question the probability of this result, or to depreciate its value. But for us, my brethren, if it be an error to rely more confidently on the purity and excellence of that form of religion which it is our office to teach, it is an error on the right side, and the one least unbecoming our profession. And I hardly see how, believing that religion to be the truth, we can do less than trust, that a measure which tends to relieve it from the principal disadvantages to which it has been subjected by the short-sightedness, or the treachery, of its nominal friends and protectors, and to give free play to its native energies, will be found in the same degree to promote its success.

Enactment to unite the Sees of Bangor and St. Asaph.

I have already occupied more of your time than I had intended with topics of general interest. Yet, before I enter upon those which immediately concern us in our several allotted spheres of duty, I feel it necessary to say a few words on a subject which, though relating to a different portion of the Church, none of us, I am persuaded, can view with indifference. You have all, I believe, observed with a lively sympathy the efforts which have been made to procure a repeal of the enactment by which the Sees of St. Asaph and Bangor are to be united when they shall next become vacant; and you have no doubt regretted that these efforts were renewed in the last session of Parliament without success, and only served, as it appeared, to rouse a more strenuous and determined opposition. You are aware that on this, as on every previous occasion, I supported the proposed change of the existing law to the best of my ability. But still I have reason to apprehend that some doubt or misunderstanding has arisen as to my present view of the question, and I am therefore anxious to take this opportunity of explaining it more distinctly than it appears in any report which you may have seen of my speech in Parliament. My conviction that the present state of the law is inconsistent with the interests, and with the legitimate claims of the Church in North Wales, remains unaltered, and has never wavered for a

single moment. I conceive that the Principality is entitled to retain all its Sees, together with every particle of the endowments it has hitherto preserved, having already contributed more than was due from it, without any compensation, to wealthier portions of the Church in England. It is true that the erection of a new English diocese, the need of which is admitted by all of us, raised a difficulty as to the best mode of reconciling this most desirable extension of episcopal superintendence with the supposed necessity of abstaining from the attempt to increase the number of spiritual peers in Parliament. But the temporary convenience of eluding this difficulty, which can hardly fail to recur at some not very remote period, does not seem to me a sufficient ground for permanently diminishing the number of the Welsh Sees. According to the original recommendation of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners however, the Principality, though deprived of one of its Sees, was to retain it revenues, which were to be applied in part "to the augmentation of poor and populous vicarages in the united diocese." But this part of the scheme, as you are aware, was afterwards abandoned, and it was provided that this surplus should be transferred to the fund which was to furnish an endowment for the new diocese of Manchester. This appropriation of the revenues of an impoverished Church to the purpose of supplying the spiritual wants of one of the wealthiest districts in England, has always appeared to me, in common I believe with the great majority of persons who have thought on the subject, a glaring violation of the plainest principles of equity. And the only plea that has been advanced in its defence will be found on examination utterly untenable. It has been contended that the Principality suffers no loss from this arrangement, because the fund which receives that surplus, also contributes to the endowment of the bishoprics of South Wales. But on the principles on which the distribution of that fund is regulated, they would have been equally entitled to that contribution, though the Northern Sees were to remain in their present condition. The argument would imply, that justice

The Principality entitled to retain all its Sees.

Revenues of the Principality ought not to be diverted to wealthier districts.

is not to be done to one part of the Principality, unless at the expense of the other.

If the Revenues are retained, how can they best be distributed?

All this seems to me so clear, that when it is fairly stated, I do not see how it can leave room for a reasonable doubt; and the voice of the country at large has confirmed this opinion. But an entirely different question has been raised by persons, most sincere and earnest well-wishers both to the Church and the Principality, and very well informed as to the condition of both, who, fully admitting the right of the Northern Sees to retain the whole of their revenues, contend that a portion of those revenues may be more advantageously applied according to the original recommendation of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners than they are at present; that the amount of episcopal superintendence which those Sees now enjoy is a smaller benefit than they might derive, if united according to the existing law, from the augmentation of poor and populous vicarages, as was at first proposed. This is a question on which, as I have always acknowledged, and as I do not wish to dissemble, I find it very difficult to form a decided judgment. I shall hardly be suspected of an inclination to undervalue the advantage of episcopal superintendence; but on the other hand, I have so constantly before my eyes the evils which arise from an inadequate provision for the parochial clergy, that I can hardly conceive it possible to exaggerate the importance of supplying that deficiency, wherever it exists. A comparison therefore between the two objects in the abstract, can, it would seem, lead to no certain conclusion. All must depend on the particular circumstances of the case in which they are brought into competition with each other. In the present instance I am not sure that they have yet been fairly weighed against each other. The question has never been submitted to the consideration either of the country at large, or of the clergy and people of the dioceses to which it relates, so as to enable any one to say how they would pronounce upon it. Their attention has hitherto been engrossed by an entirely different point: by the danger with which they have been threatened of losing one of

their ancient Sees without any compensation. But in whatever way this question might be decided, after sufficient opportunity had been afforded for its discussion, and for the expression of public opinion, though there might still be room for a wide difference of judgment as to the wisdom of the decision, there would be no ground left for the complaint, that the rightful claims of the Principality have been overlooked, and its interests unjustly sacrificed.

State of the Diocese.

I have reserved but narrow limits for several subjects of great importance and peculiarly interesting to ourselves. But the length at which I dwelt upon most of them in my last Charge may render the space to which I must now confine myself sufficient for my present purpose. In that address I did not dissemble the difficulties under which we labour, though I was aware that I ran the risk of being thought, not only to exhibit a gloomy picture, but to make imprudent disclosures. But I deemed it desirable to set our real position distinctly before you, believing that it would not discourage any who were bent on the faithful discharge of their duty, but that it might prove an additional incentive for all, *to be watchful*, and *to strengthen the things that remain*. It was evident however, that such a state of things as I then described, could not be immediately remedied by any degree of attention or diligence, and that the utmost we could reasonably hope for is a gradual but steady improvement, such as may be effected by a careful and industrious employment of the various means left at our disposal. I believe I may venture to state, without fear of being deceived by my wishes, that the diocese, on the whole, presents, I will not say a more cheering, but a less unsatisfactory aspect than it did a few years ago. There is nothing in this fact to excite any feeling bordering upon exultation or self-complacency; for if the case had been different, it would have implied an extraordinary degree of negligence and supineness; and this not simply on the general ground, that some kind of progress may always be reasonably required from every part of the Church of Christ, whenever no outward obstacles are interposed to prevent it; that it belongs essentially to the character of

such a body to be continually pressing forward toward some higher mark, to be ever striving, if not to enlarge the sphere of its influence, at least to purify what is corrupt, to heal what is unsound, to supply what is deficient, within itself; that for it not to advance, is to fall back; to be content to remain stationary, a symptom of mortal disease. This is equally true at all times; but ours, my brethren, are times in which our Church has been generally animated with a spirit of unwonted activity, and impressed with a livelier consciousness of her duties and her privileges; when extraordinary efforts have been made to repair her breaches, to strengthen her bulwarks, to cultivate her waste places, and to bring new and remote regions within her pale. Toward whatever quarter we turn our eyes, we behold abundant signs of this increased energy. If then, with all this stir of life around us, we had remained altogether unmoved, neither touched by sympathy, nor provoked by example; if, while so many labours of love, so many monuments of self-forgetting zeal, have been rising on every side of us, we had rested satisfied with the beaten round of our prescribed duties, and had been wholly unable to point to any proofs of a kindred spirit in ourselves, we should have betrayed a deplorable lethargy, or, to speak more plainly and truly, an inexcusable apathy. It has not, I trust, been so with us; and herein, no doubt, is matter for thankfulness to Him "of whose only gift it cometh, that His faithful people do unto Him true and laudable service;" but nothing to make us satisfied with ourselves; for we might have done much more, and still have fallen far short, not only of what is due to Him, but of what has been accomplished by others.

New life in the Church.

Still, while I find myself constrained to own, that what has hitherto been effected among us is, on the whole, very little in comparison with our wants, and not much even in proportion to our ability, I must not withhold a tribute of grateful acknowledgment, which is due to some (and they are not a few) who have successfully struggled with the difficulties of their position, in undertakings for the benefit of the Church, in the fields severally assigned to their ministerial labours. And perhaps after the

General improvement.

lapse of another year, I should have been warranted in taking a tone of stronger confidence and warmer congratulation; for I believe that in the course of the present year, more has either been begun, or at least designed and put in train, for the erection of new churches, or the repair of those which were going to decay, than during the whole previous period of my connection with the diocese. And it must not be forgotten, that it is not very long since the restoration of public tranquillity, after a season of agitation and distress, which pressed with especial severity on the clergy, has afforded leisure and liberty for designs of this nature; so that it does not seem hopeless, that the time is not very distant when some of us shall be permitted to witness a general renovation in the aspect of the Church in this respect. In the meanwhile, the success which has already been vouchsafed to such undertakings in some recent instances seems to me to confirm an observation which I have frequently had occasion to make: that earnest wishes for the achievement of a good object, if it be practicable, though not depending on the will of him who aims at it, are very rarely disappointed; and that strenuous and persevering endeavours to realise such wishes have never, in the ordinary dealings of Providence, been known to fail; and I should be glad if I could inspire all who hear me with my own conviction, that none of you need despair of any pious and useful work connected with the duties of his ministry, whether it be the building of a church, or the establishment of a school, or the supply of any other urgent need, if he have only set his heart upon it, so as to make it the constant subject of his thoughts, his labours, and his prayers.

Obstacles arising from division.

I am aware that there is one peculiar discouragement to which you are liable in all your attempts to promote the interests of the Church, arising from our unhappy divisions, which not only multiply your difficulties, but often embitter your success. The more faithful and zealous you are in the discharge of your duty, the more, it may be, you will rouse a spirit of jealousy and hostility, which will strive to outdo and to undo your work; so that it may seem to admit of a question, whether you are not hurting the cause you wish to serve. But a little reflec-

tion will convince us that this would be a groundless scruple, and that the thing you have most to fear from the workings of such a spirit is, lest you should in any degree be infected with it yourselves. You are not at liberty to suppress the truth, lest it should be gainsaid; nor to relax your efforts in its behalf, because they will probably provoke opposition. But, on the other hand, you must not expect to gain any solid advantage by contention and rivalry. All that we can properly aim at is, to the utmost of our discernment and ability, fully to exhibit the genuine character of our own Church. To do less than this is to fall short of our duty; to do more, or to resort to other methods as more attractive, is to sacrifice our real strength to a perhaps dazzling, but an empty and fugitive show of success.

Importance of personal devotedness.

Allow me, at the same time, to remind you, that although, when the means requisite to give fuller efficiency to your ministry depend on the concurrence of others, over whom you have no control, and can exert no influence, except by exhortation and example, you may often meet with obstacles apparently insurmountable, or such as it needs an uncommon measure of faith and courage to contend against, still the things most essential toward the fulfilment of your duties, and the real prosperity of your work, always lie in your own power, and depend on your personal activity and devotedness. Thus the condition of your sacred edifices may not be such as you could desire, and you may look round you in vain for aid to enable you to restore them to an appearance more befitting the purposes for which they are designed. But it will rest with you to preserve cleanliness and decency, and to prevent the reverence of your congregations for the service in which they are engaged from being abated by the mean and squalid aspect of the place in which they are assembled. And I need scarcely observe, that, as it is not by the abundance of your means that you can show your zeal for the honour of the sanctuary, but by the use you make of those which you possess, so even under the most unfavourable circumstances you may always guard against every appearance of wilful neglect. So again there are comparatively few among you who are able

to devote themselves exclusively to the care of a single parish; few therefore who can offer an opportunity of public worship to their people more than once on the Lord's day. And even among the cases where your duties are not so divided, there are several in which the extent of the parish renders it extremely difficult for a large part of the inhabitants to attend regularly, if at all, at the parish church. This is no doubt the greatest of all the disadvantages we labour under, and it is one which lies far beyond the reach of relief derived from any of our ordinary resources; from the funds either of the Ecclesiastical Commission, or of the societies instituted to supply such wants in populous districts. It is one therefore to which we must for the present resign ourselves, but not without letting it be seen how deeply we regret it, by the pains we take to compensate it in every way that is left open to us. Those who are not able to open their churches more than once on Sunday are not forced to keep them closed during the rest of the week. Those who cannot draw their parishioners from a distance may find themselves the more gratefully welcomed when they go to seek them in their sequestered dwellings. On this subject the slightest hint is sufficient, if it be not superfluous. After all, my brethren, it is the willing mind, which, as it alone can render any of our offerings or services acceptable in the sight of God, so above all things enables us to be useful to men. Without it, we are doing nothing even when we seem to be at work; with it, there is hardly anything which we may not hope to achieve. Outward circumstances, where it does not find them favourable to its ends, it plies until they become so. The richest mine of ingenious devices and happy discoveries, the mightiest engine for levelling all obstacles, yea, the essence of that faith which has the promise of power to remove mountains, is a willing mind.

Education of the children of the poor.

And to no department of your office are these remarks more applicable than to that which is connected with the education of the children of the poor. In no other may so much be effected with such slender means; in no other does a small outlay yield so sure and ample a return; in no other does more depend on

your personal exertions. Though it would hardly be possible at any time to overrate the importance of this branch of your pastoral duties, in our present circumstances it has some peculiar claims on our attention, so that the interest you take in it may almost be regarded as a measure of your concern for the success of your ministry; for if this is neglected, all appearances of success must be transient and delusive, and your successors may have to deplore your improvident waste of precious opportunities, which they perhaps will find irrecoverably lost. You are all aware how much the attention of others has been drawn of late to this subject: how large and prominent a place it occupies in the public mind; and that it must continue to do so more and more. The work will assuredly go on, whether with or without your aid; but the results will be very different, according to the part which you take in it yourselves, or leave to others. Here we may apply that saying, "He that is not with us, is against us; and he that gathereth not with us, scattereth abroad." Those who have not sown the seed must not think to reap the harvest. The failure of the latest, and probably the last, attempt made by the Government to provide for the education of the children of the poor in manufacturing and mining districts, called forth an extraordinary effort on the part of the friends of the Church, for the collection of a special fund destined to that object; and the parties by whose jealousy of the Church that measure had been defeated, were naturally roused to emulate those endeavours, so as at once in some degree to remedy the consequences of their successful opposition, and to guard their separate interests from this new danger. This counter-movement has penetrated to our rural districts, and may be expected to increase our difficulties, and to contract our resources in particular quarters; though it is to be hoped that it will, on the whole, produce an opposite effect, and operate as a wholesome spur to quicken our vigilance and activity. And this is likewise the chief ground of consolation that presents itself in those cases in which the work of religious education has already to a great degree been taken out of our hands. For this unhappy result may probably, in every instance,

be traced to the negligence of a former generation, and where it no longer admits of a remedy, may at least serve as a warning to us.

On the other hand we have much to animate and encourage us in the discharge of this duty; above all, the nature of the object itself. It is not with this as with some of our other ministrations: that they are commonly least valued in proportion as they are most needed. It is, I believe, very rarely indeed that the poor are found to be insensible to the benefits of education. Even when they have received none themselves, and are contented to remain destitute of it, they are commonly anxious, sometimes the more on that account, that their children should be better instructed. And many, we have reason to hope, are the cases in which the parents have been indebted to their children for religious knowledge and principles, which they would never have acquired without their assistance and example. And if such be the case in general, we may be sure that it will be so more and more, as the education we impart shall be improved in its quality, and its fruits grow more solid, and of higher and more evident value. This is a consideration which opens a clear prospect of an almost unlimited extension of the most salutary influence, to those who are able and willing to wield this powerful instrument. Beside however this common, though most precious, advantage, we enjoy several peculiar to our own times. With the aid which may be obtained from the National Society, and the Committee of Council on Education, wherever there is not an extreme deficiency of local resources, it has become much easier for us, than for those who went before us, to provide the machinery of instruction. I am aware indeed that there are districts, where the poverty and thinness of our population put it out of our power to avail ourselves of this assistance; and that still more frequently, where these causes do not prevent the establishment of a school, they keep it in a low condition, through the inadequacy of the remuneration afforded to the teachers. To remedy this evil by grants toward the maintenance of schoolmasters, is one of the objects of our Church Union Society, which it has already begun to realise, though in a degree very far short

Encouragement to the discharge of this duty.

of that which we may hope to see attained before a very long time has elapsed. And it is with feelings of still livelier satisfaction that I have now to add, that steps have been recently taken for the speedy accomplishment of an object, which I regard as still more essential to the promotion of the cause of education throughout the diocese: I mean the establishment of a central school on a footing better adapted than the present one to the purposes of such an institution. And I trust, that when this shall have been effected, we may, even without any increase of our pecuniary means, look forward to a better supply of intelligent and well-disciplined teachers.

Necessity of personal exertions.

While however I point to these grounds of encouragement, I must be permitted still to observe, that although they should animate, they can never supersede your personal exertions. If I dwell upon this topic, it is not that I would be understood to intimate that the clergy of this diocese are not in general duly impressed with the importance of the object. Several among them have proved their desire to promote it, by considerable sacrifices. But perhaps, it is not so commonly perceived and felt, how much depends on their immediate co-operation in the work, and how few parts of it can be safely intrusted altogether to the care of others. If indeed the religious instruction, which it is the minister's more especial province to communicate, is confined to the reading of the Bible, and the repetition of the Catechism, it may well seem to matter little whether he discharges this part of his office in person, or commits it to other hands; and still less perhaps could it be deemed important, if at all desirable, that it should ever be performed in the presence of the congregation. In my last Charge I recommended the practice of public catechising; and I am still convinced that it may be rendered not only profitable to the catechumens themselves, but both instructive and interesting to the congregation at large, and may even answer some important purposes which could hardly be so well attained by any other mode of instruction. It seems to me to afford an opportunity, which, under our circumstances, is peculiarly valuable, of supplying that want of correct notions on the doc-

trines of our Church, which is the common origin either of indifference, or of hostile prejudices with regard to her. And therefore I think it matter for regret that the practice should have been altogether abandoned, even where a sermon has been substituted for it. But of course no such advantage can be expected from it, where it is merely an exercise of the child's memory, and therefore nothing more than a mechanical process on both sides. On the other hand, when the business of religious instruction is conducted with a view not only to call the higher faculties of the youthful mind into action, but to cultivate the moral and spiritual nature, there it will certainly be felt to afford ample employment for all the knowledge, judgment, and ability of the minister himself, and he will be reluctant to resign it to any one else. And then, whatever else he sees to be subservient to these ends will acquire its share of importance in his view, and the more closely he applies his attention to the subject, the more will it be impossible for him to regard with indifference even the minutest details connected with the right management and well-being of the school. It may indeed be said, and not without some degree of truth, that all who have the will do not possess the peculiar talents and taste which are requisite for labouring successfully in this field. But though there are, undoubtedly, great diversities of natural capacity in this respect, I believe it will be found, that wherever the will is intently fixed on the great end of education, and the mind actively bent on the means of attaining it, there will be no lack either of a sufficiently lively interest in the process, or of a competent measure of dexterity in the conduct of it; and that the indifference or positive distaste with which it is actually regarded, by some whose station calls upon them to take a part in it, is mainly to be attributed to inattention, or, in other words, to the want of that familiarity with the subject which they might easily have acquired, either through books*, or from immediate observation.

Above all in religious instruction.

* Much useful information, and many valuable suggestions, on this subject, as well as on most others connected with the care of a parish, will be found in a work entitled "Parochialia," by the Rev. John Sandford, Vicar of Dunchurch.

I would repeat, as a general remark subject to few exceptions, that where the clergyman's heart is earnestly set on the work, there will be a school in his parish; and, still more surely, the school will ere long have become a good one. And I will take this occasion to suggest, that this is one of the matters in which you would derive the greatest advantage from the communication of your experience, views, and reflections, to one another. And therefore wherever meetings take place, such as I should wish to see held in every rural deanery, this is one of the heads to which it would be most desirable to devote a portion of the time allotted to the private conferences of the clergy. This is one of the ways in which, I am fully persuaded, such meetings would contribute most effectually to promote the welfare of the Church: one of the reasons therefore which induce me deeply to regret that the practice has not been universally adopted or steadily kept up; and which suggests the propriety of a serious inquiry, in every case where it is wanting, whether the deficiency arises from any insurmountable hindrances, or rather from causes depending on the will of the persons concerned, and implying something faulty, that requires and admits of correction.

Education of the Clergy at St. David's College, Lampeter.

I have alluded to some of the operations of the Church Union Society, by which it has begun in some measure to realise the intentions with which it was instituted; and to these I may add the foundation of two exhibitions at St. David's College of 20*l.* each: a contribution toward a most important object, in which we must all, in every point of view, feel a lively interest: that of smoothing the obstacles by which young men of the fairest promise are frequently excluded from the service of the Church, and either compelled to waste their best years in painful suspense, or induced reluctantly to dedicate their talents to the cause of dissent. I will take this opportunity of expressing my hope, that the time is not very distant when the college at Lampeter shall receive some effectual assistance from the State, so as to bring all the advantages it affords more fully within the reach of the class of persons for whom they were originally designed, and thus at

once to widen its range, and increase its efficiency. But, to return to the Church Union Society, I trust that what it has hitherto done may be considered as merely a sample and an earnest of that which it is destined to accomplish, when its funds shall be more nearly commensurate to the variety and importance of its objects. How far this hope shall be fulfilled, must of course depend on the co-operation of the laity. The appeal which was made to them last year in behalf of the Society, by the publication of the first annual Report of its proceedings, has, I am happy to say, not been fruitless; and as, in things of this nature, the chief difficulty is commonly at the outset, I venture to hope that the example of those who have answered that appeal will be more generally followed, and that the disproportion now existing between the contributions of the clergy and the laity, toward objects in which the general interests of the Church are mainly concerned, will be progressively diminished.

Missionary work of the Church.

Before I conclude this address, though I am aware that I have already detained you too long, I must still request your attention for a few remarks on another topic, not indeed so immediately connected with your ordinary duties as those on which I have been just now dwelling, but which nevertheless I thought it proper to reserve for this place, as being, like them, of a practical nature. However much your thoughts may be occupied by subjects relating to the particular sphere of your ministry, you feel it, I am sure, to be not less a privilege than a duty, to look abroad from time to time on the general prospects of the Church. However straitened may be your resources, however inadequate to the demands made upon them at home, you still believe that you may rightly and wisely spare something to promote the success of her cause in distant regions, being assured that you will never be impoverished by such liberality, and that the spiritual benefit which you reap from it far outweighs the sacrifice which it costs. I should not, I am persuaded, be doing justice to your feelings, if I were to treat the Church's missionary enterprises as a subject foreign to your minds or hearts, or as not entitled to a share in the fruits of your habitual exertions. Allow me however to

remind you, that for one of the Societies engaged in this work, which, on account of its earlier institution, the importance of its past services, and its peculiar objects, has an especial claim on our sympathy—I mean the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel—the present is a singularly critical juncture. Its actual income falls short, by twenty thousand pounds, of the amount required to fulfil its existing engagements: engagements contracted under the pressure of growing demands which Christian charity could not reject: but would probably need a much larger addition to enable the Society to carry forward its work in proportion to the exigencies of our times. But at all events, should the deficiency I have stated not be supplied, the inevitable consequence will be, that not only must the progress of Christianity, so far as it depends on human means, be arrested, but much of the ground which it has already gained must be relinquished. The light which has been kindled in many quarters where it would be shining more and more, must expire for want of nourishment. And not only must vast regions, inhabited by a heathen population, be abandoned to the power of darkness, but multitudes of our countrymen, who, if they had remained in their native land, would have been entitled to all the privileges of Christian communion, will be practically cut off from them, and be suffered to sink into a state which will probably soon become for themselves little better, and for their children perhaps something worse, than heathenism. And this will take place at a time when, in one of the most important and interesting of the missionary fields which have been consigned to the Society's care, as may be seen from the Reports of the Tinnevelly Mission, a prospect has been opened of the most cheering brightness, and the seed of the word sown long ago, but much checked in its growth, has now sprung up with a marvellous increase, which is only waiting for labourers to be sent into the harvest. I shall hardly be presuming too far on the impression which these facts cannot fail to make on you, if I believe that you will be anxious, as far as lies in your power, to avert so grievous a calamity and reproach from our

Society for the Propagation of the Gospel.

Church, and to relieve yourselves from your share of the responsibility which weighs upon all her members, who are able to come to her aid in this emergency. The mode of your co-operation toward this end must of course be left to your own discretion. But it is clear that little can be effected, hardly anything secured, by mere occasional collections; and that you will be exerting your influence most beneficially by promoting associations for the purpose of regular and permanent contributions to the Society's funds.

The work abroad and the work at home.

A topic of this nature is perhaps as appropriate as any that could have been chosen for the close of an address on such an occasion as the present. For no feeling that you could carry back with you, when you return to the discharge of your ordinary duties, can be more desirable, than a heightened consciousness of your relation to the Church of Christ militant here on earth, and a lively sympathy with her fortunes. Such a sentiment will be one of the surest preservatives against the selfishness, the indolence, and the despondency, which are so apt to beset us. The more you accustom your thoughts to take this wide range, and to dwell on the lofty objects which it presents to your contemplation, the less will you be inclined to regard the field of your own ministerial labours, by which you are so closely connected with them, as too narrow or obscure. You will be too desirous that you may be found faithful in that which is least, to repine that more has not been committed to your keeping. The general prosperity of the Church, or of any portion of it, will both console you under your own failures and disappointments, and animate you to renewed efforts, whether you view it as a token of the Divine favour which you may humbly hope to share, or as the result of zeal and diligence which you are able and are bound to imitate. And though, when you thus look abroad, you may see much that will fill you with sorrow and anxiety, still that will not be a sorrow without hope, nor an anxiety without profit, but a wholesome sadness, which will purify your faith, strengthen your patience, and quicken your watchfulness, lest haply the root of the evil you deplore be found in part in yourselves, and have sent out some of

its fibres into the ground of your own hearts. And since it is a feeling which springs directly from charity, it will dispose you to "follow after the things which make for peace, and things wherewith one may edify another:" to "bear one another's burdens," and gladly to spend and be spent for the sake of your Lord and your brethren.

III.

A CHARGE

DELIVERED SEPTEMBER AND OCTOBER, 1848.

DR. NEWMAN ON DEVELOPMENT.—PROSECUTIONS FOR HERESY.—NATIONAL EDUCATION.

MY REVEREND BRETHREN,

THE interval which has elapsed since our last Triennial Meeting has not been marked by any occurrences which can now be considered as having seriously affected the interests or position of the Church. Whatever motives for thankfulness we then enjoyed, have been permitted to subsist unimpaired. And if, during that period, the tranquillity of the Church has not been wholly unbroken, the interruption has, perhaps, been such as rather to afford a satisfactory indication of vigilance and alertness, than to excite any well-grounded alarm. For, as of late years we have witnessed an extraordinary movement not always healthy in its nature, and not rarely carried to a dangerous excess, it may be regarded as a cheering feature in the present aspect of the Church, that since that agitation has subsided, it has not made way, as might have been not unreasonably apprehended, for apathy and listlessness; but that the return of a greater measure of godly quietness has been found consistent with the maintenance of a steady, earnest, and, we humbly trust, a growing, though peaceful and well-regulated activity.

But whatever view we may take of the fact, there can be no question that such a state as this, though very desirable

at all times, is peculiarly needful at the present juncture.

Present state of the Church a cause of anxiety.

It is impossible that we can have contemplated the course of passing events without some anxiety for all that is most justly dear to us, and especially for the most sacred interests which are intrusted to our care. And we cannot but have felt this uneasiness, not the less, but the more, because it has not arisen from the visible imminence of a particular danger, but from the darkness which overhung all our prospects, and produced a general sense of uncertainty and insecurity. The quiet of the Church, so long as it remains in the world, must always, in some degree, depend on the manner in which the course of this world is at any time ordered, and can hardly escape disturbance in any great convulsions of society. And we cannot shut our eyes to the fact, that the powers which have been gaining strength in the recent turn of events are of such a nature, that we have much less to hope than to fear from their ascendancy. We know, indeed, that they are subject, whether willingly or not, to the same governance which the Church acknowledges as the stay of her trust. But we do not know what trials the Divine wisdom may see fit to reserve for us ; and, after the changes we have witnessed, hardly any can be pronounced incredible. At such a season the only earthly consolation and assurance which will not fail us in the time of need, must be sought within, in the clear consciousness that we are labouring faithfully and zealously in the work of our calling. Though the worst should befall us that the most timorous fancy can suggest, we are safe, if it find us so. That is to say, we should be safe personally and individually. And this would be enough, if we could be content to escape, each for himself, as on a plank of a wreck. But more than this is needed for the

Paramount importance of unity.

safety of the body to which we belong; *that* can only exist as a whole, and can only be saved by the preservation of unity. Now, if ever, surely, it concerns us, not for the sake of our well-being merely, but of our very being, that we should be able to present a compact unbroken front against whatever adversaries may assail us. On the eve it

may be of a harder struggle than has ever yet tried our strength, common prudence enjoins us to gather and unite all our forces. At such a time the first of duties is to seek peace at home, and to strive by all allowable means to ensure and maintain it; to draw as tight as possible the bands of Christian fellowship; to deal the largest measure of charity consistent with a regard to truth; to avoid, as far as we can, questions which tend to engender strife, and to provoke bitterness; to put the most indulgent construction on all that seems ambiguous in the words or acts of our brethren; to waive minute and merely speculative differences, and to take our stand on the broad ground of our common faith.

But to go a step beyond this, so as to suppress our convictions, and to make a compromise with error, would be to defeat our object, and to sacrifice the end to the means,—a holy end to unhallowed means; and so the Church would not be retaining any elements of strength, but rather causes of weakness, by keeping within her pale any who are in heart alienated from her, though, from whatever motive, they may be reluctant to snap the formal ties which bind them to her communion; and therefore, if we regret the loss of those who have gone out from among us, it is chiefly on their own account, and with a view to the cause rather than to the effect. We have now had time to recover from the startling and painful impression which was produced by the extraordinary number of secessions to the Romish communion, not only from our Church, but from our ministry, which took place shortly after our last meeting. They acquired a show of importance far greater than would otherwise have belonged to them from the apprehension, which they naturally excited, that they might prove tokens of a more widespread disaffection. Neither that alarm, nor the exultation with which they were hailed by our adversaries, has been justified by the event. It has shown that they are to be regarded as little more than a measure of the influence exerted by the mind and character of one man over those who had been long used to look up to him with admiration and reverence. And,

Secessions to Rome.

Dr. Newman.

23032

deeply as we must lament that such abilities should be devoted to any but the best of causes, we may seriously doubt whether the service which he has undesignedly rendered to the cause he has abandoned, in the very act of renouncing it, is not far greater than any that he will ever have done to that which he has espoused. For in this case we have an advantage which has been afforded in few others of the like kind, and which would have been hardly in any other of equal value, that of learning the grounds which appeared to him to justify so important a change. The work in which he has exhibited the latest development of his views, has received a sanction which invests it with a graver character than that of a mere profession of individual opinion, and renders it a document of some weight, as illustrating, and even determining, the relation between the Churches of England and Rome. It has been honoured with extraordinary marks of approbation, and considered as a legitimate and efficacious instrument of proselytism, by those to whose authority he is now bound to submit. It is clear that, in the main, the line of apology which it adopts is one which they admit to be tenable and orthodox. To the author himself it appears not only cogent, but indispensably necessary. The principles expounded in this work are, in his judgment, the only principles capable of supporting his practical conclusion. Those among us who may be inclined to follow his steps, have the means of counting the cost, of knowing what they must be prepared to surrender, and what to embrace, and where the ultimate ground of their faith must thenceforward be fixed. I do not say that the work is one which it would in general be proper to recommend to theological students, or to any young readers. It would be likely, in many cases, to perplex and bewilder, and partially to mislead, by confusion of terms, by vague and indefinite propositions, by fallacious reasoning, by arbitrary constructions of historical data, by erroneous appeals to ancient testimonies. Nor for those who might be able to unravel its intricate complications, would the logical exercise on subjects of such a nature commonly prove wholesome. But I cannot doubt that, whenever the result of the whole is distinctly presented to a healthy mind, free from

His Essay on Development.

Its probable influence.

prejudice, and earnest in the search of truth, it will produce an impression opposite to that for which it was designed; and it is probable that it has operated with many as an antidote or preservative.

The whole proceeds on the supposition that neither Scripture nor Tradition afford sufficient evidence in support of the present doctrines of the Church of Rome. If they had, the work would have been superfluous; its sole object is to supply that deficiency, and to meet objections grounded upon it, by showing that the lateness of the epoch at which a doctrine first makes its appearance in ecclesiastical history, does not at all invalidate its claim to be received among the articles of faith: inasmuch as there resides in the Church a never-ceasing power, not merely to explain or define the original truths of religion, but to constitute and decree new dogmas, equally binding on the consciences of men; and this not by means of any special, occasional revelations, but by virtue of her ordinary inherent authority. It is true these additions are not so absolutely new as to be entirely unconnected with the past. They are only the development or expansion of that which existed from the beginning. And various tests are proposed, by the application of which it may be ascertained whether such an addition is a true development or a corruption. It is not, however, on the result of this inquiry, which may and indeed must involve a multitude of very difficult questions, that the acceptance of the doctrine is to depend, but simply on the decision of the Church, which proclaims it through her proper organs. The validity of this decision is not to be tried by either Scripture or Tradition; but both Scripture and Tradition are to be interpreted by it. And as a development which is not a corruption must be an improvement, that whole mass of peculiar Romish doctrines, which we reject as a morbid excrescence, must be acknowledged, when viewed through this theory, as the full blossom or the ripe fruit of genuine Christianity: so that it is not only natural, but consistent with sound principle, that it should occupy a much more prominent place in the thoughts and affections of the faithful, than any articles of the earlier creed.

Principle of the work.

It reduces the controversy to one point.

By this theory our controversy with the Church of Rome is very much simplified: it may be said, indeed, to be reduced to a single point. For as the tendency of the actual development has been to concentrate the authority of the Church in the person of the Roman pontiff, all other questions resolve themselves into that of the papal supremacy and infallibility. This new position is no doubt in some respects advantageous to the Church of Rome, both with regard to her adversaries and her subjects. It enables her to dispense with many difficult inquiries into the records of Christian antiquity, relieves her from the anxiety she might otherwise feel about the issue of such investigation, and exempts her from the temptation of tampering with the evidence, into which her over-zealous advocates have so frequently fallen. And as it secures her against many assaults from without, it preserves quiet from many scruples within. For the single point of controversy becomes also the only article of explicit faith. Whoever will acquiesce in that, needs not to trouble himself about any other; and this is an attraction for all who long so much for repose, that they care little at what cost they purchase it.

The consequent weakness of the position.

But this gain is counterbalanced by some disadvantages. If the position is seemingly strong, it is one from which there is no retreat; and the attempt to occupy it implies a consciousness that no other is tenable. The right of innovation cannot be reconciled with the claim of antiquity. Though the later doctrine should be traceable to a pious usage, or opinion, of an earlier date, it is not the less absolutely new, in the most important sense, when it is established as a term of communion, and a condition of salvation. We must at least inquire who, beside the Author of Revelation, is empowered to do this. When the developing authority, whether it be of popes or councils, has to sustain such a tremendous weight, we are bound the more carefully to examine its foundations. And then we soon find ourselves drawn into a vicious circle. For the existence of this authority is no more explicitly attested, either by Scripture or Tradition, than any of the doctrines which rest upon its sanction. It must therefore

witness to itself, and hang self-supported, like the false prophet's tomb in the lying legend. For those who have been trained to look up to it with unquestioning veneration, this absence of all external warrant may create no difficulty. To them it may be sufficient to say, that "belief is in itself better than unbelief; that it is safer to believe; that we must begin with believing, and that conviction will follow.*" But for any one who has not been subject to the influence of such associations, who is required to make a deliberate choice, and to stake his all upon the adoption of a new belief, to content himself with such "presumptions and guesses and ventures after the truth," as those which form the best substitute this author has to offer for "accurate proofs," would argue a want either of judgment or of seriousness, which it may be hoped will not often be found in that class of readers for which his work is designed. Nor will that singular combination of the extremes of scepticism and credulity which it exhibits in a degree almost without precedent, recommend it to those who value either freedom of thought or earnestness of faith. To minds constituted and predisposed like his own, it may undoubtedly minister a welcome plea for yielding to that sentimental and imaginative bias, which, as I expressed my belief in my last Charge with regard to other cases, appears to have been the real cause of his own secession, and which alone enables us to reconcile the respect due to his abilities and attainments, with the esteem which we should wish to feel for his character. And while it suggests a strong ground for receiving with the utmost caution the results of an inquiry conducted under its influence, it adds all the value of a reluctant testimony to those statements and arguments which he has retracted, but has not been able to divest of any portion of their original truth and cogency.

Special advantages of the Church of Rome.

I cannot drop this subject without another observation. It must grieve us to think, that any who have not only been bred up in our communion, but have had the amplest opportunities of appreciating both its doctrines and its practical working, should fall away from it to the unreformed Church; and

* "Essay on Development," p. 327.

our regret will not be the less, if we find, as seems to have been the case in most of the recent instances, that their choice has been determined, not so much by the conclusions of a historical or theological investigation, as by a general view of the present aspect and visible character of the two Churches. Nor will it be wise or safe to seek comfort in the persuasion, that it has been the effect of some prodigious obliquity of judgment, or perversity of feeling. We need not indeed be surprised, if in such a comparison the nearer and more familiar object is under-valued, its defects exaggerated, and its merits overlooked. And we should not be doing justice to our own Church, if we failed to observe, that she is exposed to a great disadvantage by the very things which we most justly prize in her: by her wise moderation, by a holy jealousy for truth and pure religion, by her tender anxiety to avoid offending any of Christ's little ones. If she had been less scrupulous, less rigid, less self-denying in such things, she would have made a fairer show in the eyes of many. Those additions, which are now avowed and defended as such, but which we regard as the grossest corruptions of Christianity, are the very things which have contributed most to exalt and fortify the power of the Church of Rome, not only by captivating and overawing the vulgar, but by strengthening her hold on the affections of many highly cultivated imaginative minds, and many noble enthusiastic spirits. They have tended more especially to promote the temporal interests of her ministers, and to establish their ascendancy over the people; and we cannot but suspect that the perception of this tendency was not without its share of influence on the determinations of the developing authority.

Our own Church must forego these.

All such advantages our Church must forego. She may not clothe her ritual with a pomp and splendour, which not only dazzles the senses, but misleads the devotion of the worshippers, and, unless it be wholly frivolous and unmeaning, implies the admission of what she holds to be pernicious errors. She cannot hold out motives of action which she deems repugnant to the spirit of the Gospel, but which unhappily have been more effectual in producing not only specious austerities, but really

useful labours and admirable works, than the purer principles of piety, charity, and self-denial which she endeavours to cultivate.* She dares not encourage an expectation of supernatural interposition, which she knows to have been a fruitful source both of imposture and of self-delusion, and which, even when it is not associated with erroneous doctrines, appears to her to contradict the order of the Divine economy in the government of the Church. She must renounce the benefit of an appeal to a living infallible oracle for the settlement of her internal controversies. And thus she parts with many instruments of sensual and intellectual fascination, with much semblance of heroic sanctity, with frequent examples of burning zeal and indefatigable self-devotion, and with the aspect of a strongly organized hierarchy and of unbroken unity. Comparatively she may seem naked, weak, distracted. But such disadvantages and defects must appear to one who reflects on their origin, and on the price it would have cost her to be exempt from them, as matter rather of congratulation than of regret. We in particular, my brethren, must count it a happiness that we possess no authority over our flocks which we should not instantly forfeit, if we attempted to abuse it by prompting or sanctioning misdeeds.

But while we render this justice to our Church, we should certainly be deceiving ourselves if we attributed the losses she has suffered to no other causes than such as have been just pointed at, which are inherent in her constitution, and which we could not wish, if we were able, to remove. And no doubt the prolonged suspension of her deliberative assemblies is no proof that nothing would be gained by a revision of her laws,

* Essay on Development," p. 423.—"It is in vain to look out for missionaries for China or Africa, or evangelists for our great towns, or Christian attendants on the sick, or teachers of the ignorant, on such a scale of numbers as the need requires without the doctrine of purgatory. For thus the sins of youth are turned to account by the profitable penance of manhood; and terrors, which the philosopher scorns in the individual, become the benefactors and earn the gratitude of nations." Agreeing fully with Mr. Maurice ("On the Epistle to the Hebrews," p. 118) in his animadversion on the principle involved in this passage, I am not so sure that it overstates the fact. It was not to *great Romanists* (who are expressly excepted, when it is said "a higher class of motives will be felt by the saint,") that it was apparently meant to apply.

discipline, and formularies. And what it implies is not necessarily either ignorant self-complacency, or supine indifference on this head; but may be partly the apprehension and distrust with which men are used to regard the restoration of anything which from long discontinuance has become strange to them, and partly a general feeling that the organization of the representative body would need some material changes before it could be well adapted to the purpose, and might otherwise breed more evil than it cured.

The true life of the Church.

It must not, however, be forgotten, that, after all, the life of the Church does not reside in such assemblies, but in the whole body which they represent: and that, however useful they may be as organs of its consciousness, they can exhibit no higher degree of energy or intelligence than that with which it is animated. And this must be continually showing itself in a vast variety of other forms: chiefly in the mode in which its members are found generally to discharge the habitual duties of their several spheres. And on this will mainly depend, not indeed the judgment of the ecclesiastical historian or the critical theologian, but the impression which will be made on the feelings of those who at any one time are looking to the Church for the supply of their spiritual wants. And such persons will not commonly extend their survey very far beyond their immediate neighbourhood. They will be guided chiefly by the testimony of their own personal experience. And this is a consideration, my brethren, which brings the subject home to each of us. We may be convinced, and with good reason, that the Church has made an ample provision for the edification of her children, and that no one needs to go out of her for the sake of attaining to a higher degree of holiness, who has not substituted a false standard of ascetic morality and mystical devotion for the pure and simple teaching of the Gospel. We may be able to show the absurdity and injustice of trying her by any rules but her own, of charging her with that which she condemns, or of making her answerable for the omission of that which she enjoins. But nevertheless we must be prepared to find that each of us is regarded by most of those around us, as affording a

measure and test of the character and efficiency of the Church. We have too many mournful illustrations of the truth of this remark constantly before our eyes, to be allowed either to question or to forget it. It is not indeed equally certain that the visible success of our ministry will uniformly correspond to our zeal and diligence. We may not be able to overcome the force of inveterate prejudices, or to recover ground which has been long lost through former negligence. But we may be sure that our labour, faithfully bestowed on our appointed task, will not have been thrown away, even in this respect. It will at least avail to *strengthen the things which remain*, so that with God's blessing, they may become a firm basis for greater things to be superadded to them. And whatever complaints may be heard among ourselves, and whatever reproaches may be cast against us by our adversaries, with regard to the imperfections of our ecclesiastical system, and the bondage, as it has sometimes been termed, of the Church, none can honestly allege that he meets with any impediments arising from this cause, which seriously limit the field of his usefulness, or restrain him from applying all his faculties to it, or preclude him from hoping for an abundant blessing on his work.

Individual character.

The remarks just made seem, as of themselves, to turn our thoughts to another topic, of great and immediate interest to the Church. Carelessness, unfaithfulness, worldly-mindedness, though combined with a decent regularity in the performance of the legally prescribed duties of the ministry, may alienate many from the Church, and must weaken the attachment of those who adhere to her communion; but these effects are commonly confined within a narrow compass. Scandalous breaches of morality are happily, when compared with the numbers of the Clergy, of rare occurrence among them; but the mischief they occasion spreads much more widely. And every such case becomes an afflicting calamity, when the delinquent is able to brave public opinion with impunity, or escapes with a punishment manifestly disproportioned to the offence, and is permitted, after a short interval, and without

Morality of the clergy. The Bill affecting it.

any pledge or sign of amendment, to resume the trust which he had so foully betrayed. The want of an adequate provision against such an evil is itself the greatest of all scandals. The law, even as it has stood since the fourth year of the present reign, though a great advance was then made toward the attainment of the object, has been found inadequate to supply this defect. But last year a measure was prepared for the purpose, which underwent a very careful sifting in a select committee of the House of Lords, with the aid of the highest legal ability and experience, and has been generally considered as well adapted to the threefold end of protecting the Church from injury and dishonour, of securing the rights of individuals from abuse, and of inspiring public confidence in the impartiality and justice of all proceedings under its provisions.

Clause in it touching heresy.

It would, therefore, have been matter of congratulation to us, if this bill had become law; and we must regret that its passing should have been delayed—though, I trust, only until the next session of Parliament—from any cause; but most of all, that a measure calculated to confer a great benefit on the Church, should hitherto only have served to stir fresh controversies. Such, unhappily, has already been the effect of a proposal which has been made to introduce a clause into the bill to the effect: "That nothing shall be adjudged in any court of this realm to be heresy, or false or unsound doctrine, on any point treated of in the Thirty-nine Articles, that is not opposed to the doctrine of the Church of England as there declared." It might have seemed as if the chief objection to which this clause is open must be, that it is manifestly superfluous, and involves an identical proposition. For since the terms *false* and *unsound* here mean that which is opposed to the doctrine of the Church of England, it would appear as if it was proposed to enact, that no doctrine shall be adjudged by any court to be at once false and true. That whatever is declared by the Thirty-nine Articles, is the doctrine of the Church of England, is not supposed to be questioned by any one; nor if it were, to be capable of receiving additional confirmation from any new law.

Nevertheless, the proposed clause has roused vehement opposition on an entirely different ground. It has been treated as a dangerous innovation, tending to exalt the Articles at the expense of the Prayer-book, and to open a door to false or unsound doctrines, which are condemned by the Prayer-book, but not by the Articles, though relating to points treated of in them. On the other hand, the object of the clause is said to be, "to establish the supremacy of the Articles as the standard and test of doctrine in all points treated of in them; by which any question as to the orthodoxy of the teaching of one of the Clergy, on any of those points, is to be determined; and thus to preserve those whose views are agreeable to the doctrine of the Church, as there delivered with dogmatic precision, from being subjected to the yoke of unauthorized standards of faith on the same points, framed by individuals out of other sources. *" But, as it is probably admitted on both sides, and could not be consistently denied, that the teaching of the Articles does not really contradict that of any other formularies to which the ministers of the Church are required to declare their assent, it seems evident that there is a misunderstanding as to the meaning of the clause itself. In its plain, obvious, and literal sense, it appears to me liable to no objection but that which I have already stated, of being wholly superfluous. But still this must depend on the force which may be given to the term *declared*. It could hardly be contended, when a doctrine is so declared in the Articles as to be really made clear, when it is delivered so explicitly, and with such dogmatic precision, as to preclude all reasonable doubt about its import, that then it could be needful or desirable to appeal to any other standard of orthodoxy on the same point. But the case contemplated by those who are adverse to the clause, is apparently one in which the declaration in the Articles is not so full and clear as to leave no room for difference of opinions, and where the doctrine of the Church is delivered more fully and clearly in the Prayer-book. To maintain that no such case can occur, would only tend to prove the inutility of the clause.

Opposition to the clause.

* Goode's "Defence of the Thirty-nine Articles," p. 5.

And if it was meant that, even in such a case, every Clergyman should be at liberty to teach any doctrine not demonstrably repugnant to the statement in the Articles, a provision for that purpose would require, as it would seem, to be very differently framed, so as to prevent the ambiguity of one formulary from being cleared up by a reference to the other.

It would remain to be shown that anything would be gained by such an innovation. If it lowered the authority of the Prayer-book, it would not be for the sake of any enlargement of individual freedom that would result from it. For every Clergyman would still remain bound as strictly as before by his solemn declaration of assent and consent to the contents of the Prayer-book. And the distinction which it has been attempted to draw between assent to the use of the book, and assent to the things contained in it, seems futile and sophistical; even if the declaration had been confined to the use of the book,—which it is not,—assent to its use could imply nothing less than an admission of everything distinctly delivered in it; and it is evident, that even those parts which do not aim at a formal exposition of doctrine, may and do contain ample and unequivocal statements of important truths. But, with regard to the Catechism, at least, there is no ground for contending that it is inferior in dogmatical precision to the Articles; and, indeed, the doctrine of the sacraments, which was added to it upon the Conference at Hampton Court, seems better adapted to the understandings of theologians than of children, for whom an accurate description of the nature and benefits of a sacrament, to which they are not to be admitted for many years to come, might be thought somewhat premature. Nor does it appear to me that the weight due to the statements of the Prayer-book can be justly held to be lessened by a consideration of the historical circumstances under which it was compiled. It has been lately described as "a collection of national formularies of devotion, written at a period when a large proportion of the people were inclined to Romanism, and at the same time compelled to attend the service of the national churches, and, consequently, carefully drawn

Declaration of "assent and consent."

up, so as to give as little offence as possible to Romish prejudices." * A similar view of it was taken, and in some respects more correctly expressed, in the exceptions of the ministers at the Savoy Conference, where it is asserted, † that "our first reformers, out of their great wisdom, did at that time so compose the Liturgy as to win upon the papists, and to draw them into their church-communion by varying as little as they could from the Romish forms before in use." And the Bishops, in their answer, seem only to impugn this statement, so far as it was made the ground of a proposal to alter the Liturgy. They say,—"It was the wisdom of our reformers to draw up such a Liturgy as neither Romanist nor Protestant could justly except against." ‡ But, to whatever extent we may be disposed to admit the correctness of that view, it would be a supposition at once arbitrary and injurious to the compilers of the Liturgy, to surmise that they either introduced or left in it expressions which did not appear to them to convey a perfectly orthodox meaning, or that they anywhere employed language of studied ambiguity, which might have the appearance of sanctioning any dangerous error. To the Catechism, of course, the observation is entirely inapplicable.

The Articles and the Prayer-book.

The study of the Articles is an essential part of the preparation requisite for holy orders. But when they have answered the purpose of testing a Clergyman's orthodoxy, he may lay them aside for the rest of his life. He might be bound to maintain and defend the doctrine contained in them, if he saw it assailed; but they are not put into his hands as a manual or text-book for ordinary use. But the Prayer-book is to be his constant companion and guide throughout the whole course of his regular pastoral ministrations. It is highly desirable that he should be thoroughly imbued with its spirit; but, at least, it is indispensably necessary that he should understand its meaning, and should not put a construction upon it utterly at variance with its literal and grammatical sense, or with the clear mind—so far as this may be

* Goode's "Defence," p. 10.

† Cardwell's "History of Conferences," p. 305.

‡ Cardwell's "History of Conferences," p. 338.

ascertained—of the Church. In a word, an intelligent assent to the doctrinal statements of the Prayer-book seems, at least, as important a qualification for the pastoral office as a like assent to the Thirty-nine Articles. But it may well be doubted whether any expedient could be devised for securing this object more effectual than the declarations and subscriptions which have hitherto been required, and not more liable to abuse. Against wilful dishonest evasion no precaution can ever be of any avail; but where there exists a difference of opinion among sincere members of the Church as to the interpretation of the Prayer-book, it may fairly be presumed that it does not exceed the allowable limits of controversy, and may safely be left to free discussion. If not, it seems clear that no authority inferior to that of the entire Church is competent to decide it, and that every attempt to do so, instead of producing greater uniformity, is likely only to multiply contentions, and to rouse the spirit of party. And experience may serve to temper any regret that might be felt at the restraint which prevents the Church from putting forth her authority for this purpose, when we remember, not only how that authority has been at times abused, but also how difficult it has always been found to contrive formularies on such subjects large enough to admit the whole truth, and yet stringent enough to exclude every error.

Illustration from the Sacrament of Baptism.

I will advert very briefly to an important illustration of the foregoing remarks. A great part of the disputes which of late have agitated the Church, and have exposed her to the reproach of a *hollow uniformity*,* have either turned directly upon the sacrament of baptism, or are closely connected with it. The question of its efficacy, as administered in ordinary cases, according to the directions of the Church, has been a subject of much, and often of violent, controversy among ourselves. The Articles throw but very scanty light on this question. For both the general description of a sacrament in the twenty-fifth, and that of baptism in the twenty-seventh, appear to refer exclusively to

* "Essay on Development," p. 128. "By the Church of England a hollow uniformity is preferred to an infallible chair."

the case of adults, or persons of developed intellectual and moral faculties. Of the other case, all that is specially stated is merely, "that the baptism of young children is in any wise to be retained in the Church as most agreeable with the institution of Christ." The baptismal office was compiled from sources of great antiquity; and a large portion of it was transferred from formularies originally framed for the cases, not of infants, but of catechumens.* In the remainder almost all the prayers are clearly prospective, imploring blessings which imply the exercise of reason and will in the recipient. The benefit immediately conveyed by or through the sacrament is described by the terms *regeneration*, *adoption*, *incorporation*, or *grafting into the body of Christ's Church*. On the precise force and value to be assigned to these terms, and particularly to the first, the question entirely depends. Those who annex to any of them a meaning which renders it impossible to suppose that the thing signified has been imparted in every case, or even in any case before the age of reason, are driven to interpret the language of the Church as expressing no more than a charitable hope, which experience too often proves to be fallacious; and where this is the issue, it follows that the sacrament has been merely inoperative, and no more than an empty ceremony, though nevertheless entitled to respect, on account of the uncertainty which affords a ground for the charitable presumption; but yet so that, as it has been sometimes expressed, "if it were given us to read the heart, and to discern that the candidate for baptism neither is, nor ever will be a child of God, and that therefore he is and ever will continue unregenerate, we should not be justified in administering the outward rite at all." † The opposite extreme of opinion to this would be, if any one, attaching the same meaning to the terms, should hold that they describe an invariable effect of baptism, or, in other words, that the sacrament conveys an indefeasible title to everlasting life. I am not aware that such a doctrine has ever been maintained, though I am afraid it is not

* See Palmer's "Origines Liturgicæ," p. 168, fol.

† "A Voice of Warning to the Church," by the Rev. John Spurgin, Vicar of Hockham, Norfolk.

unfrequently imputed to Churchmen through ignorance or disingenuousness, sometimes perhaps not without a colour in the looseness or exaggeration of their own language on the subject.

Tendency of the opposed views.

The tendency of this opinion, if it exists, and of all such as converge toward it, is to produce a false security. The opposite view leads to an equally dangerous distrust of the Divine goodness. The one withdraws some of the strongest motives, the other the most powerful encouragements to exertion, both on behalf of ourselves and of others. It is not a question of curious speculation, but one of the widest practical importance for the whole course of every man's life, but more especially with regard to the great objects of Christian education. According to that theory which suspends the whole benefit of the sacrament on a contingency which may never arise, we have no clear and certain warrant for expecting the Divine blessing on the moral and religious training of the young. We have no assurance that the child, whom we wish to bring up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, is as yet standing in such a relation to his heavenly Father, as to be capable of reaping any solid advantage from our care and pains. We have rather reason to apprehend, that a bar still remains opposed by the corruption of his nature to the forming of good habits and a virtuous character, which no efforts of ours can surmount; and that even a fair appearance of success may be entirely delusive: so that, in cases which look most hopeful, the first awakening of spiritual life, if it is ever to come, may be still at a distance. The work of education may no doubt be carried on with conscientious diligence, notwithstanding such discouragement, and the natural and legitimate consequences of the theory may often be averted by a wiser inconsistency. But still there must always be a wide difference, both as to the spirit in which the work is conducted, and the methods employed, between the having to deal with a reality or a possibility, with an actual possession or a doubtful expectation.

The interpretation which puts least violence on the language of the Church, keeps clear of both extremes. It leaves no room for

a harassing and disheartening mistrust; it affords no resting-place for a superstitious confidence. It treats the initiating sacrament as in no case either wholly unavailing, or all-sufficient: as nothing less than the beginning of a new spiritual life, and, as such, of incomparable moment and value; but never as anything more, or as including the whole: as the first step of an infinite progress, but of one which may be checked, retarded, interrupted, so as either never to reach the goal, or to appear to proceed from a fresh starting-point: as an admission to privileges which cannot be too highly valued, but which may be forfeited, and in the regular course of things can never be realized but by Christian instruction and early discipline: as a gift unspeakably precious, not because it contains in itself a provision for the whole of every one's need, but as a pledge and earnest of greater things which may be obtained hereafter; as the origin of a series of like graces, to be successively communicated through other channels, according to the enlarged measure of a growing capacity. And thus it leads at once to unremitting diligence in the use of all appointed means, and to a continual dependence on the Divine favour, as the indispensable conditions of all that is placed within our reach.

True sense of Regeneration in Baptism.

I shall now pass, and as it happens by no very abrupt transition, to the subject which has occupied more of the attention of the Church since our last meeting than any other, especially with regard to Wales, and which still continues to excite the liveliest interest and anxiety. You will immediately have understood that I am referring to the great subject of National Education. And before I enter upon that part of it which more directly concerns the Principality in general, and this diocese in particular, I would make a few remarks on some topics connected with it which have been the occasion of very warm controversy, partly without, and partly within the Church. The fact that great masses of our rapidly-growing population are rising toward manhood in utter destitution of the means of acquiring the first elements of intellectual, moral, and religious culture: that is, of the conditions necessary not only for their individual well-being,

National Education.

but for their becoming useful, or even harmless members of society; this deplorable and alarming fact has of late—much later, no doubt, than it should—forced itself with increasing urgency on the attention of the Government. It was, indeed, impossible for any thoughtful and patriotic observer to contemplate without dread the prospects of the generation, in which those whose childhood has been thus neglected shall have reached the maturity of their physical strength, and have fully developed the appetites and passions of a wild nature, uncurbed by any sense of enlightened self-interest, much less of religious reverence or moral obligation. The imminence of the danger roused the Government to the consciousness of a duty, which had been too long left to the uncertain provision of private benevolence, now proved by sad experience to be utterly inadequate to its effectual discharge. It might, perhaps, have seemed that, though the weightiness of the duty had been rendered more sensible than it could have been at any former period, no doubt could ever have been entertained by any mind capable of comprehending the nature and end of government, or of civil society, whether such a duty existed or not; or that now, at least, this was one of the few questions on which it was reasonable to expect entire unanimity. But, instead of this, we have seen it not merely thrown out as a paradox to provoke discussion, but earnestly and passionately maintained, that no Government has a right, much less is under an obligation, to provide for, or to meddle with, the education of the people; and that it is better they should grow up by myriads in ignorance and vice, than that they should be instructed and trained through means supplied by the State. It might seem from the language frequently employed by the advocates of this opinion, as if they looked upon the State as a necessary evil, and considered every Government as essentially unholy, so as to defile all that it touches; not as what it really is, an eminently sacred institution, designed, by the exercise of its legitimate functions, not merely to protect the safety and freedom of individuals, but to promote their progress toward the highest end of their being. There may be little

Government control.

reason to fear lest a view so repugnant to all sound principles should be very long or widely prevalent; but that it should have been openly proclaimed, and have gained any degree of currency, is a melancholy sign of confusion of ideas, and still more of an excessive violence of party spirit.

If there were no difference of opinion about the right method of education, the question would not be, whether it was a part of the proper business of Government to provide the means of education for all, but whether any should be at liberty to refuse them when offered; whether a parent, who happened to be wanting in natural affection, or sense of duty, should be allowed to deprive his children of such an inestimable blessing, and to entail upon society the mischiefs which threaten it from the ignorance and depravity of its members. But, whether happily or unhappily, we are apparently far from such a state of things as might afford room for such a question. It could only arise in one of two cases; if either there were no religious differences among us, or religion could be kept apart from the work of education. Now here a point presents itself, on which opinions have been divided among those who are agreed on either side of the other question. Many excellent persons, and among them some who cannot be suspected of indifference to religion, have conceived it possible so far to separate religious from what is called secular instruction, as to remove the chief obstacle that now lies in the way of every comprehensive scheme of popular education, whether to be carried into effect by the power of the State, or left to depend entirely on private support. We could not be surprised if the advantages of such a scheme struck some persons so forcibly, as to lead them to overlook or underrate its difficulties. It is impossible for any of us to reflect, without deep regret, that because the friends of education have not been able to agree as to the best mode of conducting it, thousands are doomed to be deprived of it altogether; and that even where the disagreement is not attended with this most lamentable consequence, it frequently causes an enormous waste of the resources applicable to the work, by a sub-divi-

Separation of secular from religious instruction.

sion which renders each share less adequate to its particular purpose; substituting perhaps two or three schools of inferior quality, at a greater cost, in the room of a single good one. It has been thought practicable, by means of some simple arrangements, to remedy this evil, to effect a great economy, and to extend the benefits of education to the full amount of the need, without any sacrifice of religious principle. As there is no difference of opinion to prevent a general uniformity of practice in all branches of purely literary and scientific instruction, it is obvious that they might be communicated to all without any distinction of creed. Then if to this was superadded the religious teaching appropriate to each persuasion, it seemed as if the result of the whole would be as complete a system of education as could reasonably be desired. The machinery for this separate religious instruction was in part already supplied by the Sunday-schools, and might, as it was thought, be easily enlarged, by setting apart certain hours in the week for the purpose, when the children of each sect might retire to their private class-rooms, to be catechized by their respective ministers. *

Objections to a separation between the two.

This proposal has been received with such general disapprobation, that I should hardly have thought it worth while to offer any remark upon it, if it were not that some of the objections urged against it appear to me to have little weight, and others to require some important limitations and distinctions. I cannot attribute much force to the argument, that to remind the children in this manner of their religious differences, would tend to disturb their convictions, and to weaken their reverence for Divine truth. I do not understand how, in such a state of society as ours, the fact could be withdrawn from their continual observation, or how its tendency, if it be such as is supposed, could be neutralized by means of a more complete separation, unless at the risk of filling their minds with an uncharitable and dangerous conceit of their spiritual advantages. The practical difficulties of the scheme are evident enough; and would, probably, be found far greater in the

* Dr. Hook's "Letter to the Bishop of St. David's," p. 41.

working than they appear upon paper. Even if the regular attendance of Clergymen and other ministers could be insured for stated times in the week,—a very questionable point,—as some classification, according to age, would be necessary in the religious class-room, no less than in the common school, the amount of instruction which each class could receive on these occasions would be small, and the religious teaching would often be very nearly reduced to that of the Sunday-school. It may be true that, even in this case, as large an amount of really religious knowledge might be imparted by this plan, as is actually gained in many national schools, where the instruction is confined to the mere reading of the Bible, and repetition of the Catechism. But it must be owned, that a plan which takes its stand on a very low basis, not as a step from which to mount higher, but as the summit of its aims, and so as to exclude all prospect of a farther advance, is one which can only recommend itself as a last resource, to be adopted when we are fully convinced that we have no choice but between it and some great evil.

Importance of religion in education.

But the chief objection to this scheme, as it has been commonly understood, applies to the absolute separation which it seems to make between secular and religious instruction. It has been justly questioned, whether a scantling of religious knowledge, impressed upon the memory of children three days in the week, while, during the rest of it, not one word or one thought is inculcated in reference to their condition as "deathless beings,"* is sufficient to satisfy the notion of a religious education. It has been contended that the religious element, if it is to have any real efficacy, must not be cooped up in a separate compartment, but should pervade and animate the whole system. And it would be no answer to this objection to allege, though it may be with truth, that this is more than has hitherto been attempted in most schools for the middling and higher classes, or than has been accomplished in many even of the better conducted national schools. Schools for the children of the poor are to be regulated on the

* "The People, Education, and the Church." A Letter to the Bishop of Exeter, by the Rev. Alexander Watson, p. 26.

supposition, which is too generally the correct one, that they have to supply the want of all domestic instruction and training, and to furnish the whole stock of religious principles which the child is to carry out with it into the world. The inculcation, therefore, of these principles is their main business; and if it has been hitherto but imperfectly performed, that is a motive, not for lowering our aims, but for amending our practice. If, during the whole of the time for which the school is left under the care of the ordinary teacher, all reference to religious subjects was to be rigidly excluded, it would become a question, whether a teacher, who should be himself utterly destitute of religious principles, and so incapable of communicating them, would not be the best fitted for the office.

The very absurdity of such a question suggests a suspicion of some misunderstanding. And I am inclined to believe, that the difference of opinion between the advocates and the opponents of such a system as we have been considering, designed to give a common education to children of different religious persuasions, has commonly been much exaggerated, and often placed in a false light. But, whatever may have been the views of individuals, it is important to remember that there can be no necessity, on such a system, for a total exclusion of religion from any part of it. Those who most strenuously oppose the separation of secular and religious instruction, do not deny either, in practice or in theory, that a certain place must be allotted to specific religious teaching, and another to subjects which in themselves have no connection with religion.* On the other hand, the friends of what is called mixed education have no need to admit that any portion of the time, which is not devoted to the study of purely religious subjects, must of necessity be lost for the object of religious education. That object, we all know, is not to be attained by the mere communication of religious knowledge, however full and accurate. It will depend on the dispositions with which the knowledge is received; dispositions, which the knowledge may confirm and

The advocates of the two systems misunderstand one another.

* "Report of the National Society for 1847," p. 4.

cherish, but which it is not able to produce, or sufficient to cultivate. These dispositions are most powerfully fostered by the mere mechanism of a well-managed school; by the habits of reverence, of order, of decency, of self-control, which it is continually tending to form. And opportunities and occasions will be constantly arising, both out of numberless casual occurrences, and out of the regular course of reading, whatever it may be, which may be used to develop, direct, and quicken the child's moral sense, and to confirm the authority of the awakened and enlightened conscience by a reference to the sanctions of religion. The use actually made of such opportunities must of course depend, in all schools, on the will and ability of the teacher. No set of rules, or plan of study, can be effectual for this purpose, unless the teacher's mind and heart are engaged upon it. It seems, indeed, to have been frequently assumed that, whenever a separation is proposed between secular and religious instruction, the meaning is, that the business of the secular teacher is to be strictly confined to intellectual culture; that he will be held to be stepping out of his province if he attempts to unfold the moral and religious capacities of his pupils; that he will not be at liberty to address himself to their sense of right and wrong, much less to ground his admonitions on the fundamental truths of religion, the being and attributes of God, the responsibility of man, and the prospect of a future state,—or, in short, to introduce "one word or one thought in reference to their condition as deathless beings." I would not undertake to assert that this has never been intended or proposed; but I think that such views ought not to be imputed to any one by whom they have not been avowed in the most unequivocal language. It may, no doubt, be thought desirable that formal religious instruction should occupy a much larger and more prominent place; and that, at all times, reference might be made, whenever an occasion suggested it, to more special points of doctrine. But it would be too much to say that, if these are reserved for stated times, and are more rarely brought forward, the work which is carried on in the intervals can have no claim to the character of moral and religious education. It would,

apparently, be the fault, not of the system, but of the mode in which it is administered, if the whole work is not hallowed by a religious spirit, and is not at all times, either directly inculcating religious truth, or producing a greater aptitude to receive and profit by it.

I thought it not unseasonable to offer these few remarks on a subject of great general interest, though the controversies to which they refer have been—not set at rest, for that perhaps they will never be, but—hushed in a temporary pause, and so have ceased for a while to be of immediate practical moment. But it is not the less desirable, so long as a difference of opinion exists on this head, that the real state of the question should be clearly understood. As it is, the Government, exercising a sound discretion, have adopted a middle course, keeping clear of those difficult questions, and at an equal distance from those who wish it to do everything, and from those who require it to attempt nothing. It has acted on the wise maxim, of doing as much as circumstances permit,—not disdaining a little good, when a larger measure is not immediately attainable. It has contented itself with stimulating and supporting the exertions of private benevolence in the cause of popular education, by a distribution of the funds allotted by Parliament to that object, in grants proportioned to the amount of local contributions, and bestowed without respect to religious distinctions, and under regulations carefully framed, so as to guard against a misapplication of the public money, and, at the same time, to avoid even the appearance of the slightest encroachment on the rights of conscience, or of interference with the doctrinal teaching of any religious body. I need not enter into the particulars of the scheme detailed in the Minutes of the Committee of Council on Education, which have been published in a form accessible to all, and are familiar to very many of you from your own experience. The disapprobation it has incurred from parties of the most opposite views, is the common penalty of a wise moderation; and the pains which have been taken to excite an ignorant prejudice against it, by gross mis-statements, would

Wisdom of the action of Government.

of themselves justify a presumption, that it is not fairly liable to any serious impeachment on the score of injustice. That the Church should be enabled, by her ampler means, to profit by it, for the benefit of her children, more largely than the less opulent dissenting societies, affords, no doubt, a sufficient explanation of the hostility it has roused; but a high degree of perverse ingenuity was needed to strain this fact, the inevitable result of the equitable principle on which it is founded, into a ground of complaint. The feature which has most recommended it to the judgment of the friends of education, is the well-devised provisions it contains for elevating the general condition, character, and qualifications of the schoolmasters, by holding out inducements to the more promising pupils to devote themselves to that calling, by supplying them with the means of a thoroughly efficient training, and by securing a more competent remuneration for their labour, and a shelter from destitution for their old age. Nor shall *we* be much alarmed by the danger which has been pointed out as a grave objection to this part of the scheme: that the persons who shall have been thus fostered, reared, maintained, and honoured by the State, will be the more likely to prove quiet and peaceable citizens, contented with their station, obedient to the laws, and attached to the institutions of their country, and slow to lend themselves as tools to seditious and revolutionary agitation.

Improvement in National Schoolmasters.

It may be proper here to remark, that, in compliance with a representation made to the Lord President of the Council, on the peculiar circumstances of Wales, which was the result of communications which I had received in the course of last year from various quarters, the Committee of Council have announced, that "they are disposed, in relation to the Principality, to modify their Minutes of December, 1846, so far as to reduce to 10*l.* the minimum amount of augmentation of the salary of schoolmasters offered under those Minutes; and, in consideration of the greater cheapness of living, to require that a proportionate salary of 20*l.* only, and a house, should be provided by the school managers to meet this grant." I am glad to have this opportunity of making

this determination, which was communicated to me by the Secretary of the Committee, in a letter dated the 8th of June last, more generally known; and I trust that this modification of the Minutes will place the Government aid within the reach of a large class of cases which would otherwise have been excluded from it.

Opposition to the scheme has arisen entirely without the Church.

The opposition which has been directed against the general principles of the Government scheme, has arisen entirely without the Church, either from that narrow and radically false view of the duties and proper functions of a Government, which I have already pointed out; or, which I fear has been more commonly the real motive, from such a blind and fanatical animosity toward the Church, as would prefer that the children of the poor should be left uneducated, rather than that they should be brought up according to Church principles. Let me observe, by the way, that whenever we meet with evidence of such a spirit in our adversaries, it ought to serve chiefly as a warning to guard us from falling into the like intolerance, and from being ever carried so far by our zeal for orthodoxy, as to deny, that even a corrupt form of Christianity is something better than a state without hope, and without God in the world. But I was about to remark that, within the Church, the scheme contained in the Minutes of the Committee of Council has been received, as to its main outlines, with almost universal approbation. The benefits which have resulted, and which may be expected in a continually widening measure, from the harmonious co-operation of the National Society with the Committee of Council for their common objects, are so great, that a cessation of that harmony must be regarded by every churchman, who takes an interest in the extension of sound education, as a serious calamity. And it has, therefore, been with great concern that I have observed the progress of a movement directly tending to this disastrous issue, arising out of the Management Clauses recommended by a minute of the Committee of Council to be inserted in the deeds of schools connected with the Church of England. I would

The Management Clauses.

touch but very briefly on what I hope is but a temporary misunderstanding, to be terminated by some arrangement satisfactory to all parties; the rather, as I have not yet heard of any instance in which these clauses have been made a subject of complaint, or have prevented the promoters of schools from accepting the assistance of the Committee of Council, in this diocese. I waive the larger question, as to the expediency of entrusting such a board as the Committee of Council with the distribution of the funds allotted by Parliament for the education of the people; or of limiting its discretion by some legislative enactment. I will not enter into any minute discussion of the clauses themselves, or inquire how far they have been, or ought to be, made compulsory. I confine myself to a very general remark on the chief point in dispute. On the part of their framers, the clauses have been defended as necessary to guard against gross abuses, and misapplication of the public money. By the authors and leaders of the opposite movement, they have been represented as pregnant with the direst mischief, and the most *imminent danger to the faith of the Church.* And that this is the unfeigned belief of these persons, cannot be questioned without imputing to them a most extravagant and culpable rashness. For nothing short of such a conviction could justify their proceedings, which have manifestly tended, not merely to sever the connection which has hitherto subsisted between the National Society and the Committee of Council, but to break up the National Society itself; and to throw back the cause of education into the state from which it was raised through that Society's agency. Nor am I sure that the consequences would stop there, or that the Society has not already incurred considerable damage from their agitation. But there are two or three plain facts, which seem very clearly to point to the conclusion, that they have, at least, formed a highly exaggerated notion of the danger which alarms them. One is, that the operation which they attribute to these clauses, is entirely foreign to the avowed intention of their authors. By the Committee of Council they are considered as merely embodying the terms of union of the National

Misunderstanding respecting them.

Society, and securing their observance. Another, still stronger, indication to the same effect is the fact, that the Committee of the National Society itself was so little able to perceive the danger which is supposed to be lurking in these clauses, that they did not scruple to recommend them for adoption to the members of the Society engaged in founding National Schools. When to this it is added, that to other churchmen, apparently quite as impartial and as well-informed as their opponents, the clauses have presented an entirely different aspect, are thought to have been *unjustly assailed*, and to have given rise to *needless alarm* and *unfounded prejudice*,* we have certainly some reason to suspect, that the real mischief and danger may lie in the agitation itself, rather than in its ostensible cause; that the movement has not obtained, and is not likely to engage, very general sympathy in the Church, and that it will be powerless for good, though capable of obstructing the progress of education, and of disturbing, weakening, and dividing the Church, to an incalculable extent. I will only add, that if the same construction of the terms of union with the National Society which is put upon them by these parties, was to be imposed, as an inflexible rule, on the managers of National Schools in this diocese, I believe they would, in very many instances, be reduced to the painful necessity of choosing between their connection with the Society, and the existence of their schools.

The state of education in the Diocese.

I now pass to that part of the subject which more nearly concerns us,—the state and prospects of education in this diocese. And here our attention is drawn, in the first instance, to the results of the inquiry instituted toward the close of the year 1846, by the commissioners appointed by the Committee of Council, in pursuance of proceedings in the House of Commons on a motion made in March of that year, for an address to the Queen, praying Her Majesty "to direct an inquiry into the state of education in Wales,

* See "Thoughts on the Management Clauses," by the Rev. C. Pearson; and "The Church and The Education Question, a Letter to the Bishop of Ripon," by the Rev. H. P. Hamilton (p. 13), in which will be found a great many excellent remarks and valuable suggestions.

and especially into the means afforded to the labouring classes of acquiring a knowledge of the English language." Some months before the appointment of these commissioners, I had occasion to express my opinion in Parliament, that no fresh information was needed to convince every one who knew anything of the Principality, that there existed there a great deficiency in the means of education, and that the most important question was, how this deficiency might be best and soonest supplied; and that the only mode of accomplishing this end, which could any longer be deemed practicable, was to call forth and second voluntary private exertions by a larger amount of parliamentary aid. Now that the inquiry, with its disclosures and its consequences, are before us, some perhaps may be inclined to doubt, whether it might not have been better simply to have taken for granted the main result, which it was so easy to anticipate, and to act upon it at once in the only way sanctioned by past experience, of the utter hopelessness of any attempt to provide for the wants of the country by a more comprehensive measure. For the existence of a great deficiency in the means of education, which was already notorious enough, is almost the only point of general interest which the reports of the commissioners have placed beyond dispute. Nearly every other has but afforded matter for angry, mischievous, and bootless controversy. But while we must regret this effect of the inquiry, which could hardly have been foreseen, it is impossible to deny, that it has produced a mass of evidence, which, though it requires to be carefully sifted and weighed, certainly contains a large proportion of most valuable information.

Reports of the Commissioners for Wales.

Nor may I let myself be deterred, by the clamour which has been raised against the Commissioners and their reports, from declaring my judgment upon them. I should have been ashamed, in an assembly of educated persons, to have adverted to the absurd fiction, "that they were sent forth with instructions to make out a case, and that they had laboured to accomplish it," if this had not been asserted by persons quite capable of understanding the groundlessness

and idleness of such a charge.* Their public instructions are appended to the reports. If they received any secret instructions of a different nature, these were probably not communicated to their accusers. The most satisfactory refutation of the surmise, if any were needed, is contained in the reports themselves. As to the sagacity, cautiousness, judgment, and other qualifications of the commissioners, there may perhaps be room for a difference of opinions. But their integrity, good faith, conscientious and earnest study to elicit and record the truth, have, I believe, never been doubted by any intelligent and impartial reader of their reports. But here they labour under a very great disadvantage in comparison with their adversaries. The unscrupulous partizans who have laboured, through the medium of the public press, by lectures and harangues at public meetings, and perhaps through other less seemly vehicles of slander, to excite popular prejudice against them, might safely rely on the ignorance, the credulity, and, above all, the indolence of the great bulk of their hearers and readers, to secure them from detection, when they supported their charges by misrepresentations which could only be brought to light by reference to the context of the original documents. The parties accused could only appeal to evidence, which but few—and those the persons who least needed to be undeceived—were able or willing to examine. The process to which their reports have been frequently subjected, is one which might extract a quintessence of poison out of the Bible itself. No part could escape the imputation of bad motives. Where they simply describe, they are supposed to be covertly insinuating ridicule; where they censure, to be making out a case at the expense of truth and justice; where they praise, to have been betrayed by forget-

Extreme unfairness of the attacks upon them.

* As in an anonymous pamphlet, entitled "Artegall," which has been warmly greeted by parties whose praise should make a well-meaning man uneasy and mistrustful of himself. It has the merit of furnishing an ample refutation of the assertions with which it opens, in the great mass of the extracts brought together to prove them. But the author has forfeited the credit which he might otherwise have claimed for candour on this score, by the shallow and disingenuous artifice of introducing the quotations which make against his hypothesis by the words *own*, *allow*, *admit*, or some equivalent expression, which assumes the point in dispute.

fulness, or forced by overpowering evidence into an involuntary admission. But the most remarkable feature in the case appears to me to be this. The persons who have most strenuously assailed the reports, have put themselves forward as pleading the cause of the people of Wales, as champions of the national character, which, as they allege, the commissioners have traduced. Yet it is quite evident, not only that the commissioners have never denied or attempted to disparage either the intellectual capacity, or the natural dispositions of the Welsh people, but that it would have been utterly inconsistent with their supposed object to do so. If they have wilfully exaggerated the degree of popular ignorance and immorality which they observed, it was, as their opponents themselves complain, in order to make out a case which should prove the need of a better system of education. But if the immoral habits described, whether correctly or not, are represented as the effects of a faulty education, it is clear that the character of the people is not concerned in the question; and all that display of patriotic anxiety for the national honour might well have been spared. Indeed, it is so manifestly superfluous, as to become not a little suspicious. For if the fault lies in the education given to the bulk of the people, and if blame rests anywhere on this account, it must be not with the people, but with the class which has the chief share in the management of their education. And when we find that the persons who have most vehemently assailed the commissioners, are themselves members of the class which claims and exercises the greatest influence in this matter, we can hardly help surmising, that it was their very consciousness of this fact, their very knowledge that, so far as there is any truth in the statements which they tax with falsehood, it bears not upon the national character which they profess to defend, but upon the class to which they themselves belong, and the system which they uphold. I say we can hardly help suspecting, that it was this consciousness and this knowledge that led them to take so much pains to divert public attention from the real state of the question, and in some instances to instigate popular resentment against those who had given an unwelcome testimony.

Let me not, however, be misunderstood: I do not consider these clamorous advocates of a cause which has never been impugned, and of interests which have never been threatened, as the legitimate representatives of any class. Nor do I think that any one class ought to be made to bear the blame of whatever evil may have resulted from the system of education which has hitherto prevailed. The nature and extent of that evil are so difficult to ascertain, that it would perhaps have been safer to abstain from pronouncing any opinion on the subject; and I am inclined to regret that the instructions of the commissioners contained a clause which led and almost forced them to speculate upon it, and to invite the expression of opinions on the state of morals in particular neighbourhoods. To me it appears that such an investigation had but little to do with the main object of the inquiry. If there was sufficient proof of a great deficiency in the means of education, it might have been taken for granted that whatever was done to give *better education* would *tend to improve the morals and conduct of the people.* And where no authentic statistics could be obtained, I very much doubt whether either sweeping assertions on the morals of a district, or of the country at large, or particular instances of flagrant turpitude, were of value sufficient to counterbalance the mischief of the irritation which they were likely to produce; though it was not easy to foresee the abuse which would be made of them for party purposes. One remark, however, which may not be unworthy of our attention, is suggested by all the most credible information that has been gathered on this head. It seems to have been supposed by the persons who have endeavoured to destroy the credit of the reports, that if it could be shown with regard to one kind of immorality, which has been represented as peculiarly prevalent in Wales, that the state of things here is not worse, but rather better than in several parts of England, this would be enough for the vindication of the educational and moral condition of Wales on that head. But there is still a remarkable peculiarity in the case of Wales, which they have overlooked, or found it con-

The Report on the moral condition of the people unnecessary.

venient to keep out of view. It is, that in one most important point, deeply affecting all the relations of domestic life, the state of morals here, whether high or low, in comparison with other parts of the kingdom, is, according to admissions made on all hands, very low indeed in comparison with the ordinary degree of proficiency in religious knowledge. The striking phenomenon is, that the greatest looseness in this respect seems to be found side by side with an uncommon amount of biblical and theological learning, and a surprising familiarity with abstruse points of controversial divinity; that practices inevitably and notoriously leading to such immorality are not only tolerated but sanctioned, in otherwise decent and professedly religious households; and that certain seasons of religious exercises are not unfrequently perverted into occasions for the same kind of sensual indulgence. I do not wish to draw any inference from this fact to the disadvantage of any class of persons, or even against any system which can fairly be said to be peculiar to any religious body; but it does seem to indicate, that too much stress is commonly laid on religious knowledge and devotional excitement in comparison with moral habits and discipline.

Divorce between religion and morality in Wales.

I shall only touch upon one other point connected with this subject; one as to which circumstances, over which the commissioners had no control, appear to have operated unfavourably on the immediate results of the inquiry. I think it is to be regretted, that, according to the terms in which the object of the inquiry was originally described, it was directed to be made, not simply into "the state of education in the principality of Wales," but, "especially into the means afforded to the labouring classes of acquiring a knowledge of the English language." I think this addition was unnecessary, because the investigation of this point must have formed a main part of a full inquiry into the state of education in Wales, while the putting it thus prominently forward was attended with two unhappy effects. One is, that it lent a handle to those who wished to represent the commission as an engine

The Report on the teaching of English in schools.

framed for the purpose—among others equally injurious—of depriving the people of Wales of their ancient language. The other is, that it tended to suggest or confirm an exaggerated conception of the efficacy of schools in producing a change in the language of the country. This I regard as one of the most pernicious errors that beset this subject; and I am afraid that it prevails very extensively among persons who have great influence over the management of schools. It might have been thought, that a very little observation and reflection must be sufficient to convince every one, that a school, however well conducted, must of itself be almost utterly powerless for such an object, where the language taught in it for a few hours in the day, is one which the children neither think in, nor use at any other time. It ought, I think, to be evident that a general change in the colloquial language of the country is only to be expected from the operation of very different causes, though the school-learning may, in conjunction with them, contribute to promote it. But the persuasion of its adequacy for the purpose is not simply a theoretical error, but one which, so far as it prevails, tends most seriously to obstruct the progress of good education. For under this impression the managers of schools prohibit, not only the learning of the Welsh letters, and the reading of Welsh books, but all use of the language in school hours. One consequence of this regulation is, that the time devoted to reading is almost entirely occupied with the acquisition of a very limited English vocabulary, while the teacher, who is not permitted to hold intercourse with his scholars in the language most familiar both to him and them, can never without great difficulty ascertain how far they attach a meaning to the words they utter; and he is deprived of all the aid which he might derive from a comparison of books in both languages. And even this I do not consider as the worst mischief arising from such a system, wherever it is exclusively acted upon, and its defects are not supplied by other means of instruction. I need hardly say how little I sympathise with the persons—not, I fear, inconsiderable either in point of numbers or influence—who avowedly desire that Wales should be isolated

as much as possible from the rest of the kingdom, and value its language chiefly as an instrument for that purpose. Independently of all other considerations, I hold that no Welsh child ought to be excluded by want of instruction from access to those means of cultivating his mind, and bettering his worldly condition, which the English language supplies. But as I am likewise aware, that the actual use of these means must depend both on a degree of proficiency which the learner may not be able to attain, and on opportunities in after-life which he may never enjoy; I also hold that no Welsh child ought to be thrown entirely upon this contingency, and in the meanwhile be debarred from all such benefit as he might certainly derive from the use of books in his mother tongue. I am fully convinced, that no maxims opposed to these will bear the test of experience, and I rejoice to find that they begin to be more generally appreciated, and seem likely to exercise a greater influence on the system of popular education, than they have hitherto done.

A special topic for congratulation.

And now, my Reverend Brethren, it only remains for me to say something on the brighter prospects which have opened upon us since our last meeting; and I am glad to be able to conclude this address with a topic, which affords matter for the language of congratulation and hope. I believe there are few among you who stood in need of the information which has been afforded by the labours of the commissioners, to convince you of the great deficiency that existed in the means of education; and that, however you may question the accuracy of their conclusions on other points, those of you who have had the most experience, and who take the liveliest interest in the subject, will be least inclined to charge them with exaggeration on this. You had long felt the difficulty; you were struggling against it; here and there, under particularly favourable circumstances, with a certain degree of success; but even where this was the case, no one could look out beyond his own immediate neighbourhood without a feeling of despondency, as to the possibility of effecting any solid and extensive improvement in the state of education with none but our domestic

resources. To provide in some measure for the supply of this deficiency, was the foremost among the objects contemplated in the revival of our Church Union Society; and it was on the acknowledged importance of this object, that it rested its main hope of vigorous co-operation from persons of all classes. But even had its expectations of assistance from the opulent friends of the Church been realized to their utmost extent, it must soon have perceived a vast disproportion between the resources at its command and the end it proposed to itself. The aid which it could offer toward the erection of school-buildings, or the maintenance of schools, though not unimportant in the cases to which it has been granted, has been inconsiderable in comparison with the general need. It was however believed, that it might contribute somewhat more effectually toward improving the quality of the instruction commonly given to the children of the poor. And with this view it had resolved to undertake the founding of a Model School, and to guarantee a competent salary for a duly qualified master; and early in 1846, a convenient site was obtained for the building in the outskirts of Carmarthen.

Special fund for the promotion of education in Wales.

Such had been our efforts and our prospects, when the educational wants of the Principality began, in a more especial manner, to engage the attention of the National Society. After an inquiry, instituted by its committee, to obtain statistical returns on the state of schools, by which the extent and nature of the deficiency were more clearly ascertained, a subscription was set on foot to raise a special fund for the promotion of education in Wales. The appeal made to the public for that purpose was met with great liberality both in Wales and in England; and the administration of the fund, which amounted to upwards of 2500*l.* in annual subscriptions, and about 3000*l.* in donations, was undertaken by a body composed of noblemen and gentlemen, connected with the Principality, associated with several members of the standing committee of the National Society, under the name of the Welsh Education Committee. It is only just that I should testify, as I am able to do from personal observation, to the zeal and assiduity with which the members of this committee

applied themselves to their task, in many cases at the expense of time which could only be spared with difficulty from the most important public engagements. The view which they took of the best mode of employing the means at their disposal, coincided with that of our Church Union Society. They determined to devote their funds in the first instance to providing for the improvement of the quality of education in the National Schools, by a supply of teachers who had enjoyed the advantage of regular training. An important contribution toward this end was made by the committee of the National Society itself, which immediately placed 1000*l.* out of their special fund at the disposal of the Welsh Education Committee, to defray the expense of training persons suitably recommended, natives of Wales, and acquainted with its language, to be afterwards placed in charge of schools in manufacturing or mining districts in the Principality. But, for the permanent accomplishment of this object, it was judged expedient to found at least one training institution in the country itself; and this design has been now carried into effect by the erection of the college at Carmarthen, in the vicinity of the Model School, founded under the auspices of our Church Union Society, which will thus conveniently serve as a practising school for the training institution. Both will be ready for opening in the course of this autumn. The college is calculated for the reception of sixty students; and the plan and execution have given general satisfaction. The annual expense for each student will not exceed 21*l.*; and we have reason to hope, that, for those who are unable to meet it from their own means, a sufficient number of exhibitions will be provided by private liberality, and by the aid of the Committee of Council. In compliance with an application, made, in May past, by the Welsh Educational Committee, the Committee of Council has expressed its willingness to appoint additional inspectors, under the Order in Council of August, 1840; and its intention to select for the office natives of the Principality, acquainted with the Welsh tongue; and they have announced that, when an inspector shall have been appointed

The Training College at Carmarthen.

for Wales, they will be ready to select a certain number of young men, to whom exhibitions may be given, enabling them to enter the Training Institution at Carmarthen. The conditions under which students are to be admitted into the college, and may become candidates for exhibitions, have already been made public.

In a simply economical point of view, it admitted of a doubt, whether it was more advisable to undertake such an establishment, or to continue to make use of the previously existing institutions for the same purpose. But it was thought that the position afforded some peculiar advantages, which would not be too dearly purchased by the difference of the outlay. One was, that it presented an opportunity, which could not be enjoyed in England, for the students to gain experience in schools of the same description, and exhibiting the like difficulties with those in which they are intended hereafter to exercise their profession. Another is, that it enables and invites the untrained schoolmasters within a moderate distance, during their vacations, to share the benefit of the institution. To this must be added the effect which it may be expected to produce, in animating and sustaining the interest excited by the cause of education in the country, and in stimulating the liberality of those who witness its operations. And I am happy to be able to attest that this is not a visionary hope. The facility of grafting upon the institution a good and cheap middle school, not only without any additional expense, but with the prospect, which has been elsewhere realized, of its contributing to the support of the establishment, is another advantage, which can hardly be overrated, when it is considered how many children of the middle class receive no better education than is to be obtained at the common National Schools.

These considerations, to which others perhaps might be added, seem sufficient to justify the course which has been adopted. And it is satisfactory to reflect, that so far nothing appears to have been omitted which prudence could suggest, to ensure the success of the undertaking. We may reasonably hope, that the opening of this Training College will prove the beginning of a new and happier era for our National Schools. But it will be

wiser to commit the future to the great Head of the Church, than to indulge in sanguine anticipations. We must not shut our eyes to the magnitude of the difficulties which will remain to be overcome, even if the college itself should prosper to the utmost of our wishes; or imagine that the progress of the work can be other than gradual and slow. It is to be feared, that it may be long before a great number of our schools, compared with the whole, will be in a condition to avail themselves of the aid offered by the Government. We may, however, hope to see the number steadily increasing; and, in the meanwhile, the beneficial influence of even a few schools of a better order, scattered at intervals over the country, in raising the general standard of education, can hardly be estimated too highly.

Likely to improve the National Schools.

My Brethren, I feel that it would be not only needless, but almost invidious to press this subject farther upon your attention in the way of exhortation. I have had too abundant proofs how near it lies to your hearts, in the exertions and sacrifices which I have witnessed, made by the Clergy in all parts of the diocese for the promotion of the object. I am sure that none of you will ever regret those sacrifices, even though the immediate fruits should not fulfil your hopes, and that you will not be induced to relax your exertions by any discouragements which either the opposition of men, or adverse circumstances, may throw in your way. You will never cease to believe, as you will find it confirmed by all the results of the longest experience, that this is the field on which you have the fairest prospect of carrying out the great ends of your ministry. And I will take this opportunity of observing, that you have it now in your power to render an important service to the Training Institution, in a manner which must be most agreeable to your own feelings, by encouraging young men of hopeful abilities and character, who may fall under your notice in your several neighbourhoods, to become candidates for the exhibitions founded at the college.

I have been led by a variety of interesting topics, on which it was difficult to speak very briefly, to detain you longer than I could have wished. Yet I must not conclude without a word of

congratulation on the satisfactory settlement of the question, which had been so long agitated with regard to the two Sees of North Wales. You will all have rejoiced, that the great benefit which is likely to accrue to the Church from the erection of the Bishopric of Manchester, will not have been purchased by the sacrifice of the like advantages in the Principality, as well as by the establishment of a principle, which would have precluded the Church from adapting her episcopate to the altered circumstances and multiplied wants of the community. And having alluded to this subject, I cannot refrain from noticing another gratifying circumstance connected with it,—that the friends of the Church have taken this occasion to testify their sense of their obligations to the lamented nobleman to whose exertions the result was principally due, in the most appropriate manner, by conferring an additional benefit on the Principality, in the endowment of four exhibitions, open to competition, and to be held by Welsh students at Oxford or Cambridge. The course of the last year has been marked by a still more signal example of private munificence directed to a similar object, in the endowment of the Llandovery Institution.

Such things ought surely to be looked upon, not merely as present helps, but as tokens for good; not only as motives for thankfulness, but as grounds of hope. They encourage us to trust, that while we strive faithfully to discharge the duties of our several spheres with a single eye to our Master's service, blessings unsought and unforeseen are ever ready to light upon our work. May they only find us *always abounding in the work of the Lord*, as men who *know that their labour is not in vain in the Lord!*

IV.

A CHARGE

DELIVERED SEPTEMBER, 1854.

THE CHURCH IN THE DIOCESE OF ST. DAVID'S.—THE CASE OF GORHAM *v.* THE BISHOP OF EXETER.

MY REVEREND BRETHREN,

THE period which has elapsed since our last meeting has been marked by occurrences of no slight immediate moment to the Church, and fraught with consequences, which are perhaps only now beginning to unfold themselves; but, to my view, still more important as indications of certain mighty currents of thought and feeling, which, according to the course they may take, may produce vast changes, both in the outward and the inward condition of the Church, and in her relations to the State. To stay or control these tendencies may be beyond the power of any man, or body of men, even if it were possible for any one to stand wholly aloof from them, as a mere spectator, completely exempt from their influence. But it may not the less concern each of us, both for his inward peace and his practical guidance, to form a clear notion of their nature and bearings. And I consider it as a main part of my duty, on this occasion, to aid your judgment to the best of my ability, by the statement of my own views on the principal questions affecting the Church, which have recently occupied public attention.

But, before I enter on this larger field, I feel it necessary to advert to some topics of more immediate local interest, concerning

the condition and prospects of the Diocese which is the sphere of our common ministerial labours. The length of the period, during which I have now presided over it, would of itself naturally suggest some reflections on this subject. Yet I approach it with reluctance, because it involves matters of a personal nature. But the same cause which makes the task repugnant to my feelings, imposes it upon me as an indispensable duty. It is one which I owe to others, no less than to myself.

Great improvement in the Diocese at large.

I have not been inclined (as was sufficiently testified by my first Charge) to underrate the manifold wants and disadvantages under which the Church has long laboured in this Diocese, or the difficulty of dealing with them, or to cherish too eager expectations of their speedy removal or abatement. But I may now say, that the improvement, which I have been permitted to witness in several respects, has far exceeded the most sanguine hopes which I had allowed myself to indulge. And, first of all, I have to congratulate you on that which has taken place in the condition of our ecclesiastical buildings, and the increase of church accommodation. To you, my Reverend Brethren, this language will not seem strange, for it only expresses a fact which is more or less well known to you from your own observation. But it may well surprise those who have derived their impressions, as to the state of the Diocese in this respect, from statements which have of late been industriously circulated on the subject: and it will therefore be proper to guard against misapprehension by a few words of more detailed explanation. And on this head I may speak the more freely; because as, if the case had been otherwise, no blame could reasonably have been attached to me; so I can claim no merit for what has been done. The visits indeed which I have paid, from time to time, to, I believe, very nearly all the most secluded and least easily accessible parts of the Diocese, have not, as I have reason to think, been unattended with beneficial results. But it is a pleasure to me to know, and I am bound to acknowledge, that, in the vast majority of cases, no impulse of this kind was needed, either to set the good work on foot, or to quicken its progress.

The improvement I am speaking of is not only positive but relative, and cannot be properly estimated without a reference to certain standards of comparison. The number of churches which, during the last ten years, have been in part built on entirely new sites, in part rebuilt from the foundation, in part completely restored, is by no means inconsiderable in itself:* though it may fall very far short of what has been accomplished, in this respect, during the same period, in some other dioceses. But it may be justly said to be very great when compared with the number of similar operations effected here during a much longer antecedent period; and, still more, when the peculiar difficulties, which beset such undertakings in this Diocese, are taken into account.

Churches built and restored.

I need not remind you, my Reverend Brethren, what those difficulties are. To most of you they are but too familiar from your personal experience. They are such as not only to incline every clergyman who does not possess more than a common share of energy and courage, to put off, as long as he can, the evil day when he must take measures for repairing or rebuilding his church; but such as, in many cases, absolutely to compel him to wait until a conviction of the necessity of the work has been forced upon the parishioners, if not by a sense of decency, at least by the danger or inconvenience arising from the delay. But when this period has arrived, even if, through some happy combination of circumstances, no effectual opposition should be made to a church-rate, you are aware that the funds which may be raised in this way, even with the addition of a grant from the Church Building Society, are very seldom adequate to the purpose; and that, when the fabric to be restored is of considerable size, and especially if any attention is to be paid to the demands of architectural propriety, it is almost always found necessary to resort to the tedious, laborious, and irksome process of collecting subscriptions among the friends

Difficulties overcome.

* I have consecrated fourteen churches, and expect to consecrate another within a very few weeks. The number of churches which have been rebuilt from the foundation, or completely renovated, is between thirty and forty; and, when those which are now in progress are completed, will I believe exceed the latter number.

of the Church at a distance: and I need hardly observe how much these appeals to the charity of strangers, when they become numerous, as they have been of late, are likely to interfere with one another.

Under such circumstances, if something less had been attempted than has been actually achieved, I should not have seen any thing disgraceful in the fact, unless poverty is to be accounted a disgrace; and in what is passing before my eyes, I find matter for much joy and thankfulness. If then I should be asked whether I regard the state of the Diocese as satisfactory in this respect, I would say certainly not, in the sense of leaving nothing or little to desire; but highly so, with reference to any expectations that could have been reasonably formed by persons acquainted with its past wants and its present resources. And I will briefly advert to two or three particulars which may, I think, be justly allowed to heighten the pleasure of this retrospect. One is the growing disposition which has been shown of late years in various parts of the Diocese, not to rest content with what is strictly necessary for the purpose of public worship, nor even with such a degree of cleanness and neatness as may be looked for in an orderly private dwelling; but to mark the sacred destination of our religious edifices by their appropriate traditional forms, and, so far as means permit without the sacrifice of higher ends, by a certain amount of architectural ornament. Several of our new churches will, if I am not mistaken, bear a comparison in this respect with any on an equal scale to be found in other parts of the kingdom.* I trust that I am not apt to overrate the importance of such externals, or to confound them with the essentials of religion. But I am glad to perceive the wider diffusion of an enlightened taste with regard to objects so closely connected with the public exercise of devotion. I think that something is gained by every fresh practical demonstration, that a high degree of architectural beauty is perfectly consistent with the purest simplicity of our reformed worship. And, above all,

Improved architecture of churches.

* I allude more particularly to those of Slebech, St. Paul's Sketty, Llandilo, Tremaen, Llangasty-Talyllyn, and Llanfihangel Aberbythick.

I rejoice to see a spirit of self-denying liberality displaying itself in things pertaining to the service of the sanctuary. I have indeed now and then heard expressions of regret that the expenditure devoted to such objects had not been applied to the multiplication of homelier and cheaper places of worship. But on reflection, I am fully persuaded that this is an erroneous view of the subject, and that every such liberal outlay, instead of preventing or abridging the supply of more pressing wants, has a direct tendency to awaken a spirit of laudable emulation, which draws forth fresh resources that would otherwise have remained dormant, and to increase instead of lessening the number of similar undertakings. And I am confirmed in this belief by the fact—which is another distinct source of satisfaction to me—that several of these new churches have been erected or restored by the pious munificence of single individuals. But the circumstance which is above all cheering and hopeful, is that the improvement I am speaking of is steadily progressive: that the number of new or renovated churches is increasing from year to year; and that a spirit is manifestly abroad, from which, should no unforeseen hindrances intervene, we may fairly expect a quickening succession of like happy results.

New school buildings.

And if the state of the Diocese is thus encouraging with regard to its church fabrics, it is still more so with regard to its school buildings. The progress which has been made in this respect within the same period, particularly in the latter half of it, is such as I cannot contemplate without the liveliest feelings of joy and thankfulness. It is proved not only by the large, handsome, and commodious school-rooms which have risen in so many of our principal towns, as at Brecon, Llandovery, Carmarthen, Swansea, Haverfordwest, Solva, Fishguard, Cardigan, Aberayron, Lampeter, and Newcastle Emlyn; but by the great number, many of them on a similar scale, which have been erected in our rural villages and hamlets. And it must not be forgotten that these new school-rooms are all capable, and several of them are actually answering the purpose, of affording additional or temporary accommodation for divine wor-

ship. I may add that the greater praise is due to the promoters of these undertakings, because beside the difficulty of collecting funds for the building, the maintenance of the school commonly entails a heavy load of expense, trouble, and anxiety, which in most cases falls chiefly, if not wholly, on the clergyman.

If the state of the Diocese with regard to its churches and schools had been brought before the public for any purpose like that with which an appeal has lately been made, with very happy success, in behalf of a neighbouring diocese, I should certainly not have been tempted to weaken the force of such a representation, even if it had been somewhat overcharged, by exhibiting the brighter side of the subject. And I am now more anxious that our wants should be known, than that the efforts we have made to supply them should be duly appreciated. But the statements to which I have been adverting are manifestly calculated for ends widely different from that of exciting sympathy in our favour. They not only contain many gross misrepresentations in matters of detail,* but, while they suppress all notice of what has been done, they studiously keep out of sight the peculiar circumstances of the case, which are the main causes of our difficulties and of our weakness, and thus can only tend to mislead. Similarly partial and invidious is the notice which has been taken of the large proportion of churches in the Diocese in which service is celebrated only once on the Lord's-day. This fact can only be viewed in its true light, when placed by the side of other parts of the statistics of the Diocese: as the low average value of the livings, the scarcity of parsonage-houses, and the number of Clergymen who have the charge of more than one church. Inquiries which I have recently made for the purpose of ascertaining the present state of the case with regard to these points, have furnished the following remarkable results, in which I have no reason to suspect the possibility of any material error. I find that out of 411 benefices—the whole number contained in this Diocese—156 are under the yearly value of 100*l.*, 265 under 150*l.*, 333 under 200*l.* Of the remainder,

Poverty of livings and scarcity of clergymen.

* See Appendix.

53 are under 300*l.*, 14 under 400*l.*, 8 under 500*l.*, 2 exceed the value of 600*l.*, and there is 1 above 800*l.* With regard to parsonage-houses, it appears that there are at present only 168 habitable residences; while the care of 339 churches is divided among no more than 162 Clergymen. These facts throw a strong light on one another, and on the complaint which I have heard ever since I have been connected with the Diocese, that the supply of Clergymen is miserably inadequate to the necessities of the Church; a complaint which has been occasionally urged upon me as a ground for relaxing my general rules as to the admission of candidates for Holy Orders.

Independently however of the impediments arising from these most widely operative causes, to prevent the intention of the Church from being more fully carried out as to this part of her ordinances, there are many local circumstances, not capable of being reduced into a statistical form, which raise peculiar difficulties in dealing with the subject, and increase the reluctance and misgiving with which I should in any case enforce the introduction of a second Sunday service against the will and judgment of the minister. I trust, nevertheless, that I may still be allowed to witness a growing improvement on this head also: though I am aware that it must always be narrowly limited, so long as the impediments which I have pointed to remain; and that these are such as we cannot hope to see very speedily abated.

I shall detain you but a little longer with a few remarks on one or two kindred topics, before I pass to others of more general interest. But I must say a few words on the question of Archidiaconal visitations in this Diocese, which has of late been brought so prominently forward. I am however happily relieved from the necessity of touching on that part of the subject which personally affects myself, and of vindicating myself from the charge of having prevented or forbidden my Archdeacons, or any of them, from holding their visitations, because the state of the case in that respect is now so fully known, and so generally understood, as to render any farther explanation of it superfluous. But I think it right to

Archidiaconal visitations.

state my view of the present position of the Archdeacons, with regard to the different branches of their duties. The doubts which are entertained as to the operation of the Act of Parliament (6 and 7 William IV. c. 77) by which it was provided, "That all Archdeacons throughout England and Wales shall have and exercise full and equal jurisdiction within their respective archdeaconries, any usage to the contrary notwithstanding," can, as I apprehend, only be set at rest either by a judicial decision, of which there is no immediate prospect; or by the provisions of a new act, regulating the jurisdiction of the Ecclesiastical Courts, which has been long expected from year to year, but has been delayed through causes which I am not able fully to explain, and the duration of which I am wholly unable to calculate.* If these doubts are well founded, an attempt on the part of the Archdeacons of this Diocese to exercise that portion of their jurisdiction which relates to churchwardens, would be attended with the risk of serious incovenience. But with regard to the Clergy, though their authority would be equally defective or precarious, there would be no cause to apprehend any such danger from the exercise of it, because there is little likelihood of its being questioned or resisted. An Archdeacon might not have the power of compelling the Clergy of his archdeaconry to attend his visitation, but it may be presumed that nevertheless they would cheerfully comply with his summons. Still less can the doubts which have arisen on the question of jurisdiction prevent the Archdeacons from making those visitations of parishes, for the purpose of personal inquiry into all matters connected with the order and well-being of the Church, which appear to have constituted the most ancient branch of their functions,† and

* I am informed by a friend, that the present Archdeacons of Montgomery and St. Asaph, on their appointment in 1844, agreed in the opinion, that they had no legal power to hold Archidiaconal visitations, and came to the joint resolution of periodically inspecting the churches in their respective archdeaconries: and I know that great doubts are entertained in the diocese of Llandaff, as to the Archidiaconal jurisdiction which has been exercised there.

† "For the first six hundred years after Christ, the Bishops in their own person visited all the parishes within their respective dioceses every year, and they had several Deacons in every diocese to assist them. After that they had authority in case of sickness or other public concerns to delegate Priests or Deacons to assist

which, without at all meaning to disparage the rest, I consider as, for this Diocese at least, the most important of all. On this point I am not expressing a mere opinion or conjecture. For I am in possession of a record of such a visitation, made by one of our present Archdeacons in the year 1831, exhibiting the state of the churches in his archdeaconry in very minute detail, together with general observations and suggestionss. The impaired health of this venerable person has for a long time past disabled him from such exertions. I need not remind you of other circumstances which have induced me to rely on the aid of the Rural Deans for this kind of inspection. It may be sufficient to remark that since my appointment to the See, only one of the Archdeacons has been resident within the limits of his archdeaconry, and that one of them has during the greater part of the time lived several hundred miles away from the Diocese. I need hardly say that I mention this fact without intending to convey the slightest imputation on those whose residence has been determined by their parochial duties. To many of the Rural Deans I am indebted for very valuable assistance; and there is none among them in whom I have not found the utmost readiness to afford any which I have had occasion to request. But in a healthy state of the Church's organization each office will find its appropriate place, and neither will in any respect supersede the other. The one carries with it a greater weight of authority and influence. The other affords greater facilities of personal inspection and communication in its narrower sphere. On the other hand I must observe, that the importance of both is absurdly as well as mischievously exaggerated, when language is used which implies that nothing more is needed for the correction of whatever may be found amiss in the matters which lie within their province, than that it should be brought under the cognizance of the Ordinary. Wherever else this may be the case, it is certainly far otherwise in this Diocese. No power with which

Rural Deans.

them, and hereupon, as should seem, they cantoned their great dioceses into archdeaconries, and gave the Archdeacons commission to visit and inquire, and to give them an account of all at the end of their visitation."—Prideaux on Churchwardens, ed. 5, p. 285.

the law has invested either Archdeacon or Bishop, can provide a remedy for the impoverishment of the Church, the poverty of the people, the apathy of her friends, the hostility of her adversaries. Still less can it supply the place of faithfulness and zeal, should they unhappily be wanting, in the parochial minister, on whose spontaneous energy, though it cannot itself overcome all difficulties, more undoubtedly depends, than on any other human instrument or agency whatsoever.

The Bishop devotes the surplus of his income to augmentation of small livings.

There is still another point of a more immediately personal nature, as to which I think it right to take this opportunity of stating the course which I intend to adopt. Since my appointment to the See, I have been entitled, under an arrangement to which I was not a party, to an uncertain and fluctuating income, which has sometimes exceeded, and sometimes fallen short of its computed average amount. As I had no claim to compensation from any other source in case of a deficiency, so I owe no one an account of the surplus which has actually accrued. But with regard to the future, the state of the case is now materially altered by the recent Order in Council, by which I am enabled to fix my income at the exact amount which was originally thought sufficient. I should gladly have availed myself of this very salutary provision, if I had not been restrained by one consideration. When I reflected on the urgent wants and the scanty resources of the Church in this Diocese, I hardly felt myself at liberty, I could not bring myself, to transfer to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners any portion of the funds actually placed at my disposal. I have preferred incurring some risk of inconvenience and loss, in order that the Diocese may exclusively reap the benefit of any surplus which may arise during the next septennial cycle. With this view I have made an arrangement, by which the whole of such surplus will be applied to the augmentation of small livings in the Diocese. I have chosen this mode of applying it, not only as being most analogous to the destination to which it would have been appropriated, if it had been paid over to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, but also, because it will enable me

to obtain, through Queen Anne's Bounty, a large addition to every sum devoted to this object. The class of livings to which the benefit will in the first instance at least be confined, will be those in the Bishop's patronage of value below 150*l.* a year. Every application made for this purpose to the Governors of Queen Anne's Bounty will be communicated beforehand to the Rural Deans at our annual meeting, in order that, where a doubt may occur as to the selection, I may be aided by their information and advice, and the result of each application will be laid before them, and published in the Annual Report of the Church Union Society. At the same time, I must observe, that as the sole ground of this arrangement is the present probability of a surplus during the next seven years, if at the end of that time circumstances should be so far altered as to present the prospect of a deficiency rather than of a surplus, I should then feel myself not only warranted, but bound, on the very same principle, to take advantage of the provision by which I am enabled to secure the full amount of the income allotted to the See.

Questions affecting the Church at large.

I now proceed to address myself to the consideration of some of the leading questions which have recently agitated the Church. I must however premise an observation which has struck me very forcibly on a general view of the whole subject. It appears to me that the Church of England stands at this moment in a very peculiar situation; one, I believe I might say, without example in her own history or in that of any other Church. At no previous epoch since the recovery of her purity and her independence, has she displayed more evident signs of life, vigour, and energy. Whether we look abroad or at home: whether we consider the increasing zeal, activity, and success with which she has been carrying forward her vast missionary work: the new and enlarged provision which she has made for its future progress, both in her domestic institutions, and in the great number of completely organized colonial churches which she has planted within the course of a very few years: or, turning to objects which we have more immediately before our eyes, we observe the efforts which

she has been making to supply the wants of her growing population: the rapid multiplication of churches, and schools, and training institutions: the exertions of the societies which collect and dispense a large part of her resources for pious uses: the examples of self-denying charity and munificence exhibited by her individual members: the ready and liberal answer which is made to every appeal on her behalf: the lively interest which is manifested in every question that affects her welfare: the earnestness and ability with which her cause is maintained at every disputed point of theological controversy: look whichever way we will, we find sure tokens of health and strength, from which it might seen safe to augur, not only lasting stability, but increasing prosperity. These are not the exaggerations of partial friends, but indisputable facts, attested by the reluctant admission of her adversaries. To whatever degree her system may be justly charged with defects or abuses, at least it cannot be said, that there is any want of will to investigate and correct them. It would, of course, be quite consistent with such a state of things, that the Church should, at the same time, be assailed by the most violent attacks from without. But the strange thing is, that in the midst of all these grounds of thankfulness, hope, and confidence, there should be heard from many quarters within the language of alarm and despondency, gloomy forebodings of impending disasters, complaints as of men labouring under almost intolerable evils, which must either drive them out of our communion, or force them to seek a remedy in organic changes of indefinite extent, and of very uncertain and perilous issue.

The judgment of posterity.

It is possible that a thoughtful inquirer of some future day, looking back to the times in which we are living through a vista of several generations, with the consequences of the events which we are witnessing fully unrolled before him, may more clearly understand, and more correctly estimate, this singular contrast than any one can do now. Such a one may perhaps be able even to trace a connexion of cause and effect between the things which are seemingly so inconsistent with each other; between the earnestness, the

zeal, and devotion, which are displayed in so many useful and laborious undertakings, and in so many generous sacrifices, for the benefit of the Church; and the restlessness, the impatience, the jealousy, and anxiety, which vent themselves in fruitless repinings, in acrimonious discussions, and in impracticable projects. It remains to be seen, whether we shall furnish an example, which will be among the most memorable in history, of that deplorable infatuation through which groundless fears sometimes become the instrument by which they are realised, and men cast away their most solid and precious blessings, in their struggle to escape from slight evils or imaginary dangers. But whatever may be the judgment of posterity on other points, I am strongly persuaded that it will assign a very different degree of importance to many passing events which have created a violent ferment in the Church, from that which they assume in the view of contemporaries. And I believe that to no transaction of our day is this remark more applicable, than to that which has engaged a larger share of public attention and interest than any ecclesiastical question within our memory. I allude, of course, to the case of Gorham *v.* the Bishop of Exeter. I do not mean to say that this case is not in many respects a very memorable one. It would be so, if it were only for the singularity of many of its features, in which as it is, I believe, without a precedent, so I trust it will ever remain without a parallel. But I conceive that in no other instance has there been so great a disproportion between the intrinsic moment of the fact and the excitement which it has occasioned.

Gorham *v.* the Bishop of Exeter.

The question branches into two distinct heads: that of doctrine, and that of jurisdiction. These two points must be carefully kept apart; since those who hold together on the one, may be divided as to the other. With regard to the one, the question of doctrine, if we listen to the language solemnly and deliberately used by persons of high station and authority in the Church, the effect of the Report of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in this case, is in the highest degree injurious and alarming: it is nothing less

Two questions. 1. The question of Doctrine.

than to repudiate a main article of our Creed, and thus to commit the Church, if remaining passive she tacitly adopts the decision, to the sanction of erroneous doctrine, and so to divest her of the character of an orthodox and truly Catholic Church. With regard to the question of jurisdiction, it is alleged that the constitution of the tribunal, by which the final judgment was pronounced, is inconsistent with the rightful claims which the Church is bound to assert; a usurpation of her authority to which she cannot submit without renouncing her duty, forfeiting her spiritual privileges, and resigning herself to a degrading and corrupting bondage. These are, no doubt, very grave questions, and would fully justify the importance which has been attributed to the case, if they had been raised on sufficient grounds. But my belief is, that the more fully the case is considered, the more clearly it will appear, that it involves no such consequences: that it has not altered the character or the position of the Church, and has not even disclosed any divergency of belief or opinion among her members, which was not previously, indeed from the very beginning of her Reformation, patent and notorious, and comprehended within the latitude allowed by the language and spirit of her formularies. I think that this is already becoming more and more generally understood and acknowledged, while more recent occurrences have detracted not a little from the authority of the names which lent their support to the opposite opinion. But it cannot be deemed superfluous that I should explain the reasons which have brought me to this conclusion.

Precise limits of the doctrinal controversy.

It will be convenient at the outset to mark, as accurately as we can, the precise limits within which the doctrinal controversy appears to range. And I must observe, that the difficulty of doing so is greatly increased by the peculiar circumstances in which the case originated. I need not inquire whether it is ever either expedient or necessary, that an examination to which a minister of the Church is subjected by his Bishop, should assume the character of a scholastic dispute; but it is clear that whenever this actually

happens, there will be no less danger than in other like cases, that the parties should misunderstand each other, that each should keep his eye exclusively fixed on one side of the subject, that they should use the same terms in different senses, and should miss the real point of the question; and I cannot but think that such has been the case in the present instance. It was stated in the course of the judicial proceedings, with the express concurrence of the learned Judge whose sentence was reversed by the final decision, that the question at issue between the parties was, "Infant Regeneration unconditionally in and by Baptism." In other words, the connexion between Baptism and Regeneration in the case of infants is the main point on which the controversy turns. Hence it is manifest, that, unless the disputants come to a clear understanding as to the meaning which they attach to the term *regeneration*, any proposition concerning it may be affirmed by the one and rejected by the other, without any real, though with an apparent, contradiction between them. Yet that learned Judge, after a very long and elaborate critical review of the controversial Examination, toward the close of his judgment, having observed that to him it appeared "that the doctrine of unconditional Regeneration in the Baptism of Infants is (supposing the words of the office to be taken in their natural and literal sense) sufficiently established," proceeds to say: "But then the difficulty is this—to ascertain what is meant by the word Regeneration." He then goes on to point out that the word is capable of widely different meanings, which he discusses at some length; and he cites several writers of high authority in favour of the opinion which he adopts as to the meaning to be assigned to the word in the offices of Baptism. But as to the sense in which it was understood by the two parties before him, he is altogether silent: nor indeed was it possible for him to say what it was, because he did not find this any where stated in the record of the Examination. But he does not even advert to the remarkable fact, that in the whole course of that discussion, in which, as he himself states, the question at issue was, "Infant

Meaning of Regeneration not defined by either of the parties.

Regeneration unconditionally in and by Baptism," that ambiguity which raised the difficulty he has had to deal with,—a difficulty for which he has only found a solution in the private opinions of a few eminent divines,—had not been cleared up between the parties themselves by either definition or explanation, nor even directly noticed, so as to show that it was distinctly present to the mind of either of them.

Particulars in which they are agreed.

Let us endeavour notwithstanding, as well as we may, to ascertain the amount of the agreement and the variance exhibited in their views of the subject, that we may be the better able to appreciate its practical and speculative import. In one class of cases, at present indeed the smallest, but anciently, and in the times to which we look for the most authentic expositions of the doctrine, the most numerous, the cases of adult Baptism, there appears to be no difference between them: there is a perfect agreement as to the conditions on which the efficacy of Baptism depends. In another much larger class of cases, that of baptized children who die in their infancy, there is also a complete coincidence as to the practical result, though there is a difference as to the nature of the process which leads to it. It is admitted on both sides that such infants are undoubtedly saved. And it must be owned that on the one side this admission is very remarkable; being made on the ground that "the Church has so ruled," by one from whose principles it could hardly have been expected that he should have acknowledged the authority of the Church to rule such a point. But the admission is still more remarkable on account of a hypothesis with which it is coupled, and which in this respect appears to be peculiar to himself. For in every such case he maintains the necessity of a previous inward preparation, which he describes as an act of *prevenient grace*. And here I must remark that, although the phrase, so applied, may be new, still it is not quite correct to speak of the thing as *a figment*, of which he is *the author and inventor*, and which is probably held by *scarcely any one beside himself*.*

* Dr. Mill, "Human Policy and Divine Truth. A Sermon preached before the University of Cambridge," p. 18.

The tenet is certainly not new in itself, and all that is peculiar or original in its recent promulgation is its connexion with the admission which I have just mentioned. It was propounded long ago, though not in exactly the same terms, by Calvin. Calvin takes common ground with the impugners of Infant Baptism as to the absolute universal necessity of a previous qualification in the recipients of Baptism, without distinction of age; but he joins issue with them on the question, whether infants are capable of an internal qualification.* He denies that even the most tender age is altogether incapable either of inherent faith or of repentance. He distinguishes indeed between these dispositions, as they exist in infants, and as they are experienced by grown persons. He will not speak positively as to their identity, or even their likeness in these two cases.† But he sees no absurdity in attributing to infants something analogous to both faith and repentance: something which he endeavours to illustrate by the figures of a *spark* and a *seed*, and which he also describes more simply as a *part* of a grace to be afterwards enjoyed in its full measure.‡ And he lays it down as "an invariable principle, that Baptism is not conferred on infants in order that they may become children and heirs of God, but because they are already so accounted by God, the grace of adoption is sealed by Baptism in their flesh." § This I apprehend to be the very thing which is described in the modern theory as *prevenient grace*. In this therefore—whether it be justly called a *figment* or not—there seems to be little novelty or peculiarity.

Mr. Gorham's tenet not new; substantially that of Calvin.

* Inst. IV. c. 16 § 17. At quomodo, inquiunt, regenerantur infantes, nec boni nec mali cognitione præditi? Nos autem respondemus, opus Dei, etiam si captui nostro non subjaceat, non tamen esse nullum.

† Ibid, § 19. Non quod eadem esse fide præditos temere affirmare velim quam in nobis experimur, aut omnino habere notitiam fidei similem (quod in suspenso relinquere malo).

‡ His second answer to the objection grounded on Baptism's being pœnitentiæ ac fidei sacramentum, is, "Baptizari in futuram pœnitentiam et fidem, quæ etsi nondum in illis (infantibus) formatæ sunt, arcana tamen spiritus operatione utriusque semen in illis latet. Hac responsione semel evertitur quicquid adversum nos torquent a Baptismi significatione petitum." Ib. § 20.

§ Epist. 193. Semper tenendum hoc principium est, non conferri Baptismum infantibus, ut filii Dei fiant et hæredes, sed quia jam eo loco et gradu censentur apud Deum, adoptionis gratiam Baptismo obsignari in eorum carne.

But the singularity of the modern view consists in this: that the dispensation of Providence by which some baptized infants are taken out of the world in their infancy, is supposed to be invariably preceded by the act of grace which prepares them for a worthy reception of Baptism: so that the fact of their premature death is conclusive evidence that they have been singled out for a mark of Divine favour, which other baptized infants do not enjoy. This is a proposition which Calvin I believe never maintained, and would not have adopted: for it is foreign, if not directly repugnant to his principles. If it may find room, it has at least no proper place, in his system. He would probably have condemned it, as a presumptuous intrusion into the secret of the Divine decrees, and as tending toward a dogma which he rejects, that of the indispensable necessity of Baptism to salvation, maintained by S. Augustin, and taught by the Church of Rome.* And, on the other hand, it must be owned that nothing short of the most explicit and authentic testimony would be requisite, to prove that this was the view with which the Church ruled, that "children which are baptized, dying before they commit actual sin, are undoubtedly saved." But I must add that in my judgment the reason assigned for the supposed necessity of that mysterious predisposition is utterly untenable. It is, as you are aware, that original sin is an impediment to the worthy reception of Baptism. This would, of course, be a mere truism, if it is assumed that a worthy reception of Baptism implies the previous remission of original sin. But considering it as an argument, and not as a mere statement of the proposition to be proved in another form, I am quite at a loss to understand, how man's sinfulness, since it is happily not an insurmountable bar to the operation of God's mercy through Christ, should be so at one time more than at another: how it should impede the worthy or beneficial reception of Baptism, and yet should not intercept an act of prevenient grace before Baptism. The question cannot be, whether man is worthy or meet to receive, but whether God is

In what respects it is singular.

[* See, for instance, Catech. Rom. Pars II. cap. 2, § 31.]

willing to bestow. And of His will we must judge not from our surmises, but from His promise and command. If we have reason to be satisfied that we are obeying His word in the administration of the ordinance, we have surely sufficient warrant to believe that it is accompanied with His blessing. And it is much to be lamented that any one who acknowledges the command, should nevertheless treat it only as a motive to obedience, and not also as a ground of confidence. And this I think fully meets an objection which is very often urged as perfectly conclusive against the doctrine of Baptismal grace, that, if that concomitance is held to be invariable, we tie the grace of God to an act which depends upon the will of man. This objection would indeed be valid, if the act was not authorized by a Divine command: but then the legitimate inference would be, not that it may be performed without any beneficial effect, but that it ought not to be performed at all: as the Anabaptists—on their principles very consistently—contend. Surely it cannot derogate from the freeness of the Divine bounty, that it is dispensed according to a certain law of Divine appointment, though the will of man co-operates to carry the law into execution. And what is so done ought not to be considered as the act of man, but of God, by whose revealed will that of the human agent is governed and directed.

But still, however arbitrary and visionary, and incongruous with the system into which it is introduced, may be this hypothesis of prevenient grace, it seems evident that, with regard to the class of cases we have been considering, that of children dying after baptism, before they commit actual sin, it is a purely speculative adjunct to the doctrine of the Church, which has no practical operation or bearing whatsoever. It does not tend in the remotest degree to affect either the conduct to be pursued toward them by those who are interested in their welfare, or the prospect of their future condition. It remains then to consider the largest class of cases; that of persons baptized in their infancy who attain to the age of personal responsibility.

And here it must be owned, that the difference between con-

ditional and unconditional efficacy of Baptism, when considered in the abstract, appears at first sight so great, as almost to justify the strongest language which has been used with regard to it. And I am far from thinking that it is one of slight practical importance. I believe, as I intimated on a former occasion, that it has a very weighty bearing on the method and the spirit in which the work of Christian education is conducted in the school, and still more in the family; though one, it must be observed, which only shows itself in those comparatively rare cases, in which that work is consistently carried on according to either view. But if we ask (and this is the question which most nearly concerns us for our present purpose) how far this difference affects the work of the ministry in the dispensation of the Word and Sacraments, we shall find that the practical result shrinks into a very narrow compass. For those who insist on the unconditional efficacy of Baptism, nevertheless admit and assert, that all the benefit to be derived from it, after the age of responsible action has begun, depends on the very same conditions of faith and repentance, which, according to the other view, are necessary for its worthy reception. And they do not hold that the fulfilment of these conditions is so placed within the power of every baptized person, that he has no farther need of Divine assistance; on the contrary, they strenuously maintain that it can only be accomplished by a diligent and successful use of the means of grace. And thus it appears that a minister of our Church, who most highly exalts the baptismal privilege, will measure the actual condition and prospects of those who have received it by the same standard, and will teach, admonish, and exhort those who are committed to his charge to the same practical effect, as one who is in doubt whether they brought what he conceives to be the requisite qualifications to their Baptism.

Conditional and unconditional efficacy of Baptism.

Meaning of the term Regeneration.

But we shall be better able to estimate the importance of the controversy, if we look a little closer at the state of the question itself, as it appears in the record of the Examination, which contains all the evidence

on which the opposite decisions were founded. I have already observed, that, although the whole controversy confessedly turns on the conditions of regeneration in infant Baptism, it was not clear that the disputants were agreed as to the meaning of the term *regeneration*. But I believe I may go much farther, and say, that it is evident, from their language, that they did not understand it in the same sense. I will, however, confine myself to the remark, which is more material, and may be more easily proved; that the sense in which the doctrine of baptismal regeneration was denied by one of the parties was not that in which it has been taught by divines of unquestioned orthodoxy in our Church. By him regeneration is manifestly regarded as an inward change of the moral nature, which, if opportunity is afforded, will surely display itself, in some measure, in the sensible and visible fruits of the Spirit. But the most approved descriptions of baptismal regeneration do not include, at least as an essential element, any such inward change. They point not to a change of habit or disposition, but to a new state, relation, or capacity, which is by no means invariably attended with any perceptible moral effects. Take, for instance, Hammond's enumeration, which was clearly meant to be complete and exhaustive, of the benefits of infant Baptism. The first is, that, on God's part, it "secures to the infant a non-imputation of Adam's transgression," and "receives him into a covenant of grace, where there is pardon reached out to all truly penitent sinners, and assistance promised and engaged, and bestowed upon very easy conditions—humility, and prayer, and affiance in Him." "The second is, the entering the infant into the Church where the knowledge of duty dwells." The third is, "the imposing a bond and sacramental obligation upon him; an oath, a vow; which being the condition, upon the constant performance whereof all the promises of endless bliss are made over to him by God, it is not possible for one that prizeth his own good to wish it had not been made." The fourth and last is, that "it is solemnized with the prayers and benedictions of the Church, which are always of great efficacy to bring

Hammond's view.

down that which is prayed for, but are especially so when they are annexed to an institution of Christ, such as Baptism is known to be."*

Doctrine of the Church Catechism.

And nothing more than this is expressly contained in the terms by which the Catechism describes the benefit received in Baptism. It is an incorporation into the body of Christ, adoption into the family of God, a title to the inheritance of the kingdom of heaven, — that is, a present, but defeasible title, to a future contingent possession. It is a state of salvation: the state of those who should be saved, who may be saved, who will be saved, if they fulfil the conditions on which their salvation depends. The chief, if not the only doubt on this point relates to that gift of the Holy Spirit, for which prayer is made on behalf of the child before Baptism, and which, unless we adopt the so-called charitable hypothesis, must be held to have been conferred in Baptism. But it appears to me that we may very well believe this gift to be really received, and yet need not adopt the theory of an *infused virtue*, or *a mysterious earnest of the Holy Spirit*, or of an *initial and seminal grace*.† This theory seems to proceed on the arbitrary assumption, that the gift cannot be really bestowed unless it takes immediate effect; though what the effect is in the case of infants, no one has been able to explain; and, on the contrary, it is admitted, that in them "the infused virtue of the Holy Ghost is, to speak in the mildest terms, dormant and inactive," and "merely a potential principle."‡ Why should we not rather say, that it is a real and present gift of the Holy Spirit, not in any such scanty measure, but in all His fulness, yet according to the capacity of the recipient, and therefore in this case not immediately available, but to be dispensed hereafter according to God's good pleasure under the conditions of the baptismal covenant? And then it is simply equivalent to a state of grace and salvation, in the sense already explained. The speculative difference between these two

Baptismal Regeneration defined.

* Of Fundamentals, chap. xix.

† Bishop of London's Charge, 1850, p. 32.

‡ Bishop Bethell on Baptismal Regeneration, p. 121.

modes of conceiving the baptismal gift is indeed clear enough: it is the difference between a simple *pledge* and an *earnest*, or a pledge which contains some small portion of the thing secured; but the practical difference, if there is any, is so slight as to be hardly appreciable. The learned Judge himself to whom I have alluded, dwelt much on this distinction, though without giving the benefit of it to the party whose orthodoxy was impeached. Yet it is plain that one whose idea of regeneration implies a moral change, if he denies that such a regeneration invariably accompanies Baptism, even when rightly administered, does not contradict those who, maintaining the unconditional and universal efficacy of Baptism, describe it as consisting in a change of state or relation. It may be thought desirable to guard, as far as we can, against this ambiguity, by restricting our use of the word, according to the practice of ecclesiastical antiquity, to its sacramental sense, marking this sense by an appropriate epithet, and substituting another term, such as *renovation* or *conversion*, to express its more popular signification. But we cannot require any one to adopt this limitation: and I do not find that it was regarded heretofore as a test of sound churchmanship. Hammond, for instance, did not incur the imputation of heresy, though he did not scruple to employ the terms *regeneration* and *conversion* as exactly equivalent, or constantly to address baptized persons as yet unregenerate.* The question however

Regeneration and conversion.

* Sermon xxx. (Libr. of Angl.-Cath. Theology), p. 644. "If any one out of a full violent course of sinning conceive himself *converted and regenerated*." Ibid. p. 639: "Now, O powerful God, on those of us *which are yet unregenerate*, bestow thy restraining grace, which may curb and stop our natural inordinances, and by a sober, careful, continent life, prepare us to a better capability of thy sanctifying Spirit." Sermon xxi. p. 464: "*For those of us which are yet unregenerate*, though we obtained no grace of God but that of nature and reason, and our Christianity to govern us, yet let us not contemn those ordinary restraints which these will afford us," and so *passim*. See especially Sermon xxvii., where at p. 588 occurs the following remarkable passage, which I can only understand as a distinct assertion of the charitable hypothesis: "God's supernatural agency attends *most ordinarily* till the time of our Baptism, when the Spirit, accompanying the outward sign, infuses itself into their hearts, and there seats and plants itself, and grows up with the reasonable soul, keeping even their most luxuriant years within bounds; and as they come to an use of their reason, to a more and more multiplying this habit of grace into holy spiritual acts of faith and obedience; from which it is ordinarily said that infants baptized have habitual faith, as they may be also said to have habitual

now is not as to the proper use of words, but as to the agreement or disagreement between the things signified. It is, whether baptismal regeneration may not be, and in the case before us has not been, denied in a sense perfectly consistent with the doctrine of the Church, as expounded by those who assert it.

I am aware that in the course of that Examination expressions were used by the respondent, which, taken by themselves, would seem to convey an opinion, that there may be cases in which the Baptism of infants, regularly administered, is not only attended with no subsequent benefit to the recipients, for this it is admitted on all hands may often happen, but confers no present and immediate benefit of any kind or degree, and is a mere empty inoperative form. But these expressions ought in common candour to be construed in connexion with the general subject of the inquiry: and then I think it will appear, that they really relate to that benefit which depends on the fulfilment of the conditions stipulated in the baptismal contract. At all events this point was not so distinctly brought forward, or so fully discussed, as to make it clear that the proposition was meant to be understood in a strictly literal and absolutely unqualified sense. No one who reads that Examination can fail to observe, that Mr. Gorham was led, and almost compelled, to fix his attention almost exclusively on the negative side of the subject; that he was much more concerned to state what Baptism does not give, than what it gives. His one main object throughout was to guard himself against any admission implying a belief, that the sacrament, *ex opere operato*, imparts a gift involving not merely the possibility, but the absolute certainty of future spiritual benefits, reaching perhaps, in his view, even to the attainment of everlasting life. Nothing less than this would be the effect of regeneration according

Mr. Gorham states what Baptism does not give rather than what it does.

repentance, and the habits of all other graces, because they have the root and seed of those beauteous healthful flowers which will actually flourish there, when they come to years. *And this, I say, is so frequent to be performed at Baptism, that ordinarily it is not wrought without that means, and in those means we may expect it as our Church doth in our Liturgies, where she presumes at every Baptism that* 'it hath pleased God to regenerate this infant by His Holy Spirit.'"

to Calvin's system. We have indeed no evidence to show that Mr. Gorham assents to that system in its full extent, although he adopts Calvin's hypothesis of prevenient grace. But there is as little to show where he stops short of entire concurrence with it. And the argument with which he contends against the unconditional efficacy of infant Baptism, on the ground that it subjects the work of the Spirit to the will of man, and fixes it at the precise "moment when man thinks fit to direct" that it shall take place;* this favourite argument, I say, derives its main force from that theory, and depends entirely on the supposition of an inward renovation of the spiritual nature. But that on this or any other principle Mr. Gorham would have felt himself bound deliberately to maintain, that the reception of Christ's ordinance, in conformity to His institution, and in obedience to His command, introduction into His visible Church, solemn consecration to the service of God, and entering into a covenant of faith and obedience, are things which in themselves neither import, nor carry with them any kind or measure of spiritual benefit or privilege, not so much as a present capacity of future blessings, this is more than I am able to infer from Mr. Gorham's language, and is what I should be loath to impute to any minister of our Church, who has not avowed the opinion in the most unequivocal terms. I do not see how this can be maintained, unless nothing is to be accounted a spiritual benefit, which may be neglected, wasted, and forfeited, without having been ever turned to account. It would seem to follow that no benefit is conferred upon the child when he is made the subject of religious teaching and training, because it is possible that he may never profit by it, and that we have no reason to be thankful for any means of grace or hopes of glory, which do not imply an absolute certainty of final salvation. I cannot help thinking that, if this were admitted, it would go far to narrow the controversy as to the conditional or unconditional efficacy of Baptism, and would reduce it to a question of degree and amount, as to which a large latitude might be safely allowed for difference of opinion.

* Exam. p. 109.

At the same time, I must avow my belief, that the notion of a covenant is essential to the nature of Baptism. I cannot admit that this view is at all affected by the fact, that the exigency of the case sometimes renders it necessary to dispense with the formal and express stipulations required in the public and regular administration of the rite. I agree with Mr. Gorham, that in such cases those stipulations must be held to be implied, and that in all cases alike the benefit to be realized by the recipient, when he has come to years of discretion, depends on his acknowledgment and fulfilment of the contract. I think that this is sufficiently proved by the language of the Church, which declares that "Baptism doth represent unto us our profession." I find it confirmed by writers of high authority, and I do not know of any by whom it has been denied. If the stipulations do not arise out of the nature of the thing, it would be difficult to defend the use of them in the case of infants. Hooker seems very express on this point: "If any," he says, "be desirous to know why interrogations should be ministered to infants in Baptism, and be answered unto by others as in their names, they may consider that Baptism implieth a covenant or league between God and man." "The law of Christ requiring faith and newness of life in all men by virtue of the covenant which they make in Baptism, the Church in Baptism exacteth at every man's hands an express profession of faith, and an irrevocable promise of obedience, by way of solemn stipulation."* It seems clear that, according to Hooker's view, the covenant was quite independent of the form in which it might be expressed.

The notion of a covenant essential to Baptism.

Hooker.

One of the arguments which Hammond, in his "Practical Catechism,"† draws from Scripture in favour of infant Baptism, rests on the same ground. Commenting on the words of St. Paul, "but now are your children holy," he says, "that is, as I conceive, the infant children of the Christian parents which, were it not upon that forementioned ground of hope and presumption, that living with the Christian

Hammond.

* E. P. v. 64, 4. † P. 371.

parents they will be taught to know their vow of Baptism, could not in any reason be differenced from the children of heathens, or allowed any privilege above them, are now hereby holy, that is, are now upon this ground thought fit to be baptized without any scruple, whereas the heathen children, being to live with those heathen parents, are not thus holy, that is, are not admitted to Baptism." I do not mean to pledge myself for the correctness of the interpretation, or for the soundness of the argument, or for all the inferences which it may seem to warrant. But it is clear that to this author the vow, the profession, the engagement, appeared to be so essential to Baptism, that where there was no reasonable hope or presumption that the children would be afterwards taught to know it, as the first step toward the fulfilment of it, there it was better that they should not be admitted to the sacrament. So Bishop Wilson: "By the Sacrament of Baptism God is graciously pleased to enter into covenant with His creatures."* I will only add a few words from Thorndike, a very learned and able writer, and of what are called very high Church principles. They occur at the outset of an elaborate discussion of the subject, and contain the main proposition of his treatise: "I say, that a sincere and resolute profession to undertake Christianity, and to live according to it (believing as our Lord Christ hath revealed, and living as He hath taught), consigned to God in the hands of His Church by the Sacrament of Baptism, is that condition which the covenant of grace requireth to qualify us for the promises which it tendereth."† And afterwards, in confirmation of his view, he adduces "the express doctrine of the Church of England in the beginning of the Catechism, declaring three things to have been undertaken in behalf of him that is baptized: and again, in the admonition to the sureties after Baptism."‡ And he expressly states, that the reason for which he asserts "the necessity of Baptism to the salvation of all Christians," is

Bp. Wilson.

Thorndike.

* "Essay toward an Instruction for the Indians;" Works, in Anglo-Cath. Library, vol. iv. p. 205.

† "Covenant of Grace," chap. ii. § 1. (Library of Anglo-Cath. Theology.)

‡ Ibid. chap. iv. § 17.

that "upon which the necessity of the Baptism of infants is to be tied."* I need not say which way these passages point; but certainly, if this is a correct view of the subject, it is one which has a very important bearing on the whole question, and cannot be safely rejected or overlooked. That, I think, is an error quite as mischievous in its tendency as any of those which are imputed to Mr. Gorham; verging on the one hand toward superstition, and on the other toward Antinomianism.

Sentence of the Judicial Committee not opposed to the Nicene Creed.

If, on this view of the subject, I can see no just grounds for alarm at the innovation in doctrine which is supposed to have been sanctioned by the final sentence of the Judicial Committee in the Gorham case, still less can I perceive that this decision infringes the authority of any article of our Creed. I was indeed very much surprised when I first heard that it was supposed to involve any such consequence: and I am still as much as ever at a loss to understand how the Article to which reference has been made—that by which we are taught to acknowledge one Baptism for the remission of sins—can be properly considered as either decisive of the controversy, or as having any material bearing upon it. Indeed, if that were so, it would have been needless to refer to the Creed. For whatever may be the force of that Article, it cannot be greater than that of the words of Scripture on which it was founded. It cannot prove more than the Apostle's exhortation, "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins." If the Apostle's language is not conclusive as to the nature of the connexion between Baptism and the remission of original sin in the case of infants, to whom the exhortation was not, and could not be, addressed, the Article is still less explicit and definite on that point. And not only so: but it appears to me clear, from the very wording of the Article, as well as from its historical origin, that it was not pointed against any error with regard to the efficacy of Baptism, but against the repetition of the rite. For this purpose an acknowledgment of one Baptism was sufficiently

* "Covenant of Grace," chap. v. § 11.

precise. But if the object had been to declare the faith of the Church on any question relating to the efficacy of Baptism, something more would have been required than the shortest possible allusion to the Apostle's words. It is evident that the Article assumes the existence of complete unanimity on this head. Nor does it appear that any question had been raised as to more than one kind of Baptism which called for determination. This is a construction of the Article which seems not to have occurred to Hooker, when in the course of his reasoning against the "iteration of Baptism," he wrote: "As Christ has therefore died and risen from the dead but once, so the sacrament which both extinguisheth in Him our former sin, and beginneth in us a new condition of life, is by one only actual administration for ever available, according to that in the Nicene Creed: I believe one Baptism for remission of sins."* But this point has been so fully and ably discussed of late, that I need not dwell upon it any longer.† I will only add a few words of another of our elder divines, who was never suspected of leaning toward Calvinistic doctrine: "We say that we believe the forgiveness of sins" —"but I hope not absolutely, that the sufferings of Christ shall effectually clear every man's score at the day of judgment: well then it must be meant only of those that by repentance and faith are grafted into Christ."‡ Hammond therefore thought this "explication and restriction of the Article," as he calls it, quite consistent with the language of the office which declares the baptized infant to be "grafted into the body of Christ's Church."

The Creed says nothing as to the efficacy of Baptism.

I proceed to make a few remarks on the other branch of the subject: on the effect which has been attributed to the decision of the Judicial Committee, and on the constitution of the Court of Appeal. Let it be assumed that the

2. The judicial question.

* E. P. v. 62, 4.

† Archdeacon Hare's "Letter to the Hon. Richard Cavendish," and "Postscript" to the same: and the recent Charge of Archdeacon Sinclair.

‡ Hammond. Sermon xxviii. p. 608.

original judgment pronounced in the Court of Arches was right, and has been improperly reversed: that it condemned opinions repugnant to the teaching of the Church on an important point of doctrine. Does it then, even on this supposition, follow—as we have been told it does—that "the final judgment commits the Church of England to heresy?"* not to ask whether—as has already been rhetorically argued, "it virtually ignores the existence of dogmatic truth, and abrogates all Catholic doctrine†." To estimate the correctness of the assertion, we must lay the merits of the judgment, as it affects the party principally concerned, entirely out of our consideration. The question is not, whether certain opinions were rightly or wrongly attributed to Mr. Gorham, but whether, being contrary to the doctrine of the Church, they have now by virtue of the judgment been fastened upon her: that is, in other words, whether having previously been contrary to the doctrine of the Church, they have now ceased to be so. It would certainly be strange, if the decision could have an effect not only foreign, but directly opposed to the express intention of its authors. It is clear that they not only did not design to produce any such change, but that their very object was to avoid doing so. The judgment of the Court below might indeed be viewed in this light. It was, in fact, considered by some, as introducing a new determination of doctrine; and, as far as its authority reached, declaring the mind of the Church on a point which had not before been even judicially decided. That was the very ground on which it was reversed. The Court of Appeal did not feel the same confidence as the learned Judge of the Court of Arches in the conclusion at which he had arrived. They did not venture to go so far, to do so much. They wished to leave the doctrine of the Church precisely as they found it; not to erect, but to prevent the erection of any new barrier to the exercise of the ministry within her communion. The question, relating to a very abstruse and complicated subject, appeared to them to be involved in a

Effect of the decision.

* Mr. Badeley's "Speech before the Privy Council," Preface, p. xxiii.
† Ibid. p. xxiv.

degree of obscurity and perplexity, through which they could not find their way to a clear determination; and therefore, they felt themselves bound, whatever might be their private opinions and convictions, to abstain from pronouncing on it in their judicial capacity. The very head and front of the complaint made against their judgment is, that it was not positive but negative, not dogmatical but dubious, not exclusive but comprehensive. Now, it seems to me, that we have our choice only between two suppositions. Either there was, or there was not, room for honest and reasonable doubt on the subject in intelligent and well-informed minds. If there was room for such doubt, then it seems clear that the Judicial Committee not merely exercised a wise caution and moderation in taking a neutral course, but that they had no right to do otherwise, and that they would have been overstepping the bounds of their province, and usurping the authority of a different body, if they had taken upon themselves to decide the question, and thus to force a new doctrinal definition on the Church. On the other hand, if there was no room for a sincere difference of opinion on the point, if there was nothing really obscure or ambiguous in the language of the Church, if its true construction was perfectly plain and obvious, and the doctrine it expressed was manifestly irreconcilable with the propositions by which it was said to be impugned, then, whatever other consequences might result from the judgment, as to the doctrinal position and character of the Church it must be wholly without effect. It can neither alter the letter, nor obscure the meaning of her words, and it can as little exert any moral influence, as it possesses any canonical weight. There is a Church in which the authority of a single doctor has been held sufficient, not only to decide the subtlest questions of scholastic divinity with unerring certainty, but to establish new articles of faith, and new terms of salvation. And there are persons who profess to have been driven to seek refuge in the bosom of that Church, by the innovation alleged to have been made in ours through the misdecision or indecision of the Judicial Committee. Let us rather, my brethren, be thankful that we

Wisdom of the decision.

have no tribunal which lays claim to such authority. The existing Court of Appeal is not, and makes no pretence to be, an organ entrusted by the Church with her authority in controversies of faith. On the contrary, it is a notorious fact, that it has unexpectedly found itself charged with the exercise of functions, which were not contemplated in its original establishment; and if it has fallen into glaring error in the discharge of its duties, the only reasonable inference would be, that there is a defect in its constitution which calls for amendment. Plans for such amendment have been repeatedly proposed to the Legislature, and though I felt myself obliged to withhold my concurrence from that which was brought forward in the session of last year, it was not because I was satisfied with the present constitution of the Court of Appeal, but mainly because I thought I saw reason to believe, that the plan would rather aggravate than allay the excitement which was then prevailing in the Church, and might perhaps precipitate the rupture which it was designed to prevent. The discussion however was attended with one very happy result. It elicited the admission of an important principle: namely, that the Court which was to take cognizance of matters of doctrine, ought to be exclusively composed of members of the Church whose doctrine was brought into question. Another admission almost equally valuable was virtually made in the concession, that Bishops, being Privy Councillors, should be not merely invited to attend but should be of right members of the tribunal in such cases. For this must be considered as a virtual admission, that legal learning and experience, even when combined with such an interest in the welfare of the Church as may be fairly presumed in her members, are not sufficient elements in the composition of such a tribunal: but that to these should be added that familiarity with the special subject of the questions submitted to its decision, which could only be expected from persons who are devoted by their profession and office to the study of theology. I cannot admit that this last qualification is the less needful, because nothing more is required in such cases, than to

Nature of the Court of Appeal.

Bishops should be members of it.

compare the actual doctrine of the Church with propositions which are alleged to be repugnant to it. I think it must be but too evident from recent experience, that such a comparison may be attended with great difficulties, for the solution of which the aids of minds conversant with theological distinctions may be as much needed, as forensic learning and habits of thought for the application of the law to a particular case. But the proportion in which these qualifications should be contributed by the members of the Court, is a different question. And as to this I must own, that one feature of the last proposed plan, which appears to have been with many persons its chief recommendation, namely, that questions of doctrine were to be referred to a tribunal composed almost exclusively of Bishops, seemed to me liable to grave objections. It tended, if it was not expressly designed, to countenance an opinion to which I cannot assent, that Bishops, by virtue of their office, and independently of their natural and acquired qualifications, and their peculiar responsibility, possess an inherent and inalienable right to be *the* judges—that is, finally to decide—on questions of doctrine; and therefore, it must be supposed, some special exemption from the dangers of error. I could not go this length. Nor can I sympathize with the complaints which have been heard of "a civil court overriding the Archbishop's court on a question of doctrine," as "a direct usurpation."* Such a complaint, when we consider the particular circumstances of the two opposite judgments, is certainly very surprising. Whether the learned Judge who sat in the Archbishop's court possessed any advantage over the Court of Appeal in point of theological erudition, it might be invidious to inquire. But assuredly he could claim none on the score of his ecclesiastical character.

But Bishops should not be the only judges of doctrine.

It was natural that the agitation excited, whether with or without sufficient ground, by the various subjects of controversy to which I have been adverting, should strengthen the desire which

* "The Union of the Spiritual and Temporal Authorities in one and the same Ecclesiastical Court." A Letter to the Right Hon. William Gladstone, M.P., by William Perceval Ward, M.A., Rector of Compton Valence.

had previously been felt in many quarters for a revival of the synodical action of the Church: and that this should now be looked to with increasing earnestness, as the true and only effectual remedy for the evils under which she was thought to labour, and especially for that discord which is undoubtedly the greatest of all, and which appeared not only to obstruct her work and to impair her strength, but to endanger her very existence. And it is not surprising that persons who are deeply impressed with the magnitude of the present or threatened evils, and firmly convinced of the efficacy of the proposed remedy, should grow impatient of delay, and should regard the continued withholding of the right to exercise functions which they deem indispensable to the well-being and the safety of the Church, as an oppressive grievance, a sign of cruel indifference, if not of positive ill-will, on the part of the civil power. But when this grievance, whatever may be its amount, is represented as one peculiar to the Church of England; when it is asserted, that "the Church of England is the only Church in Christendom which is deprived of the privilege of synodical deliberation," this statement, taken in the sense in which alone it is relevant and important, appears to me to be at variance with unquestionable facts. The suspension of synodical deliberation in the Church of England has not lasted, and is not likely to last, longer than in the Church of Rome. It is true there has been no cessation of synodical assemblies *in* the Church of Rome—though these have for many ages been of rare occurrence—but there has been no synod *of* the Church of Rome since the Council of Trent. And it is not universally agreed, even among Roman Catholics, that this deficiency is sufficiently supplied by the supreme authority of the Pope: and, however urgently required, such an assembly could not be brought together without the sanction of the civil power, not in one only, but in many states.

Desire for revival of Convocation.

Still, so long as we consider the subject in the abstract, and confine ourselves to the general notion of a representative deliberative assembly, the wish that has been expressed for the

revival of such assemblies in the Church seems both natural and reasonable, and it is one from which I cannot withhold my sympathy. The power of deliberating on its own affairs seems inseparable from the very notion of a corporate body, which is not a mere machine or passive instrument of a higher will, and therefore most especially to belong of right to a Christian Church. But this theoretical view of the subject, however indisputably just, is totally foreign to the practical question which has been actually raised, as to the revival of the dormant powers of Convocation. No Convocation, hitherto known to our Church, has the slightest claim to the character of a National Synod, or of an assembly representing even the English branch of the Anglican Communion. This is manifest, not only from the history of our Convocations, which shows that they were originally convened for the purely secular purpose of imposing taxes on ecclesiastical property, but from their constitution. They not only do not represent the Church in either of the two English provinces, but they could no longer be allowed, for any practical purposes, to represent the Clergy. It is clear that before they could be qualified to exercise any powers, affecting either the general interests of the Church, or the rights of any of her members, they must undergo a great organic change, and be recast in an entirely new form. An assembly convened for such a purpose, whether under the name of a Convocation, or any other, would in fact be nothing more or less than an ecclesiastical Convention, charged with the task of modelling the future constitution of the Church. But, if this is the case, can it be just to reproach any Government, I will not say with hostile feelings toward the Church, but with a want of due regard for her welfare, because it declines the responsibility of trying, or of sanctioning such an experiment?

Our Convocations neither national nor representative.

It is not however on account of this risk or difficulty, that I am most strongly inclined to question the expediency of reviving Convocation under our present circumstances. I believe that there is less reason to dread the failure of an attempt to remodel it in a satisfactory manner, than its complete

Dangers besetting a revival of Convocation.

success. For I think there can be no doubt, whether we consider the temper of parties in the Church, or the avowed objects of those who are most eagerly pressing for such a measure, that such an assembly, however it might be finally constituted, would immediately become the scene of a violent struggle between the maintainers of opposite views of doctrine for the ascendancy of their respective principles, and that the effect would be either to aggravate and embitter our present dissensions, or to terminate them by an open, formal, and probably incurable breach of unity: a result which some among us appear already to contemplate without alarm, if it is not their distinct and almost avowed aim. This, it appears to me, is the danger against which the friends of our Church ought, at the present crisis, to be most on their guard, both as the most formidable and the most imminent. Even on the supposition of that which I fear we have hardly yet earned a right to hope, that the spirit of charity and moderation should preside over the assembly, though it might avert the worst evil, I do not see how it could be reasonably expected materially to better our position with regard to the causes of our chief danger. I can well understand the great advantage of synodical deliberation in the free interchange of views and opinions, among those who are agreed in their general principles and ends, and only differ from one another as to the choice of means, but I doubt very much that oral discussion, in a large assembly is, in our day, the most promising expedient for bringing theological controversy to a satisfactory conclusion. It is to Synods, convoked for such a purpose, that the witness of Gregory Nazianzen, as to those of his own time—"*that he had never seen one which had led to any good result, and had not aggravated evils rather than remedied them*"*—

* Epist. 55 ad Procop. Ἔχω μὲν οὕτως, εἰ δεῖ τἀληθὲς γράφειν, ὥστε πάντα σύλλογον φεύγειν ἐπισκόπων, ὅτι μηδεμιᾶς συνόδου τέλος εἶδον χρηστόν· μηδὲ λύσιν κακῶν μᾶλλον ἐσχηκυίας ἢ προσθήκην. These words are clearly inconsistent with the assertion of Hickes (Prefatory Discourse, in answer to a book entitled "Rights of the Christian Church," § VII), that "what that holy father wrote was only written of the Council of Constantinople:" nor is there any better ground for that of Billius (in Argum. epist.), "Hujus quidem epistolæ auctoritate ad conciliorum oppugnationem Calvinus abutitur, sed neminem piorum movere debet. Nec enim de generalibus, sed de particularibus quibusdam conciliis loquitur." There may be

was peculiarly, if not exclusively, applicable: and, so applied, it has been largely confirmed by all subsequent experience, and ought to serve as a perpetual warning.

But let us come yet a little closer to the main point. The objects of a Synod, I apprehend, are twofold: solemn, common deliberation, and authoritative, binding decision. With regard to the former of these objects, it may be true, and I have already intimated my belief, that, at least for certain purposes, a Synod offers some peculiar advantages, which are not to be found in any other mode of dealing with the same subjects. But is it not either an oversight or an exaggeration to say, that in this sense the Church of England is deprived of the privilege of synodical deliberation? Is there, in fact, any limit to the right which her members enjoy—in common with those of every other religious body in this country who are not placed by the terms of their communion itself under restraints from which members of our Church are exempt—to the right, I say, of conferring together both privately and publicly on matters concerning the Church, of propounding and defending their own views, and of discussing those of others? And this, it must be remembered, is a right which all could not exercise in a representative assembly. So far indeed is this right from having been taken away, or suspended, or abridged, that it may fairly be doubted whether it has not of late been sometimes abused. One, and not the least forcible, argument in favour of the revival of Synods is, that while they afford a free vent to all opinions, they impose a wholesome restraint on heated partisans and noisy demogogues, who might exert a noxious influence in a narrower sphere, but are there soon brought down to their proper level, and made comparatively harmless. But it cannot be truly said that our Church has been deprived even of the form of synodical deliberation. And I

The power of synodical deliberation exists already.

more truth in that of Dupin, quoted in a note to the passage of Hickes (Angl. Cath. Libr., p. 144). "Cette maxime qu'il à écrite étant chagrin contre le Concile de Constantinople, qui ne l'avait traité assez favorablement, ne doit passer pour une règle, mais seulement pour une espèce de ressentiment, qui est échappé à S. Grégoire."

account it one of the happy consequences of a state of things, which, in other respects, I deeply deplore, that it has caused this fact to become matter of public notoriety. Whatever may be my opinion as to the occasion which suggested the convocation of the Diocesan Synod lately held in the Diocese of Exeter, and as to the value of its proceedings, I rejoice at the additional evidence it has afforded of the freedom we enjoy under our existing institutions. There is nothing to prevent the example from being followed in every other diocese as often as it may seem desirable. And I need hardly observe, that nothing would be easier than to enlarge our annual meeting of Rural Deans sufficiently for the like purpose, to invest it with all the formalities, and to dignify it with the title of a Diocesan Synod. I should indeed be loath to draw a large body of the Clergy from their homes, unless for the transaction of business which they felt to be really important; but I should joyfully afford them an opportunity, if they have it not already, of communicating to me their opinions and advice on subjects of common interest to all of us, as freely as I have now been delivering mine. Then again, though the forms and the name of a Synod have been wanting to the conferences which are held from time to time by the Bishops, they surely have none the less of the substance. If those who so meet should so far abuse their privilege, as to exert their combined influence for the purpose of thwarting the Government in its plans for promoting education, or for any other purpose still less beseeming their sacred office, it would not be on account of that formal and nominal defect in the character of their proceedings, that such an attempt would prove ineffectual, and would incur general reprobation; and, on the other hand, the expression of their opinions, wishes, and plans for the good of the Church, would not, on that account, carry any less weight with those whose concurrence might be necessary to give effect to them.

Bishops do hold Synods already.

With regard therefore to the power of deliberation, although it may be that much is left to desire, I think there is no just ground for complaining that the Church is subject to any intolerable restraint. And I believe that something very different is meant

by the language which we now so often hear, which represents her as working in chains, and pining in bondage, and by the charge of timidity or servility brought against those who fill her highest offices, as acquiescing in her misery and degradation. I think it is plain that all this points to the want of quite another kind of power, that of authoritative binding decision, which many would like to see exercised by a purely ecclesiastical assembly; and, without which, they would set little value on any Synod, or rather would be the more dissatisfied, the more its constitution corresponded to their wishes. Now, it is true, the Church does not possess, and, as long as her relations to the State remain what they are, never will nor can possess such a power of synodical action as this, by which the majority of a Synod would be able to bind the minority and the rest of the Church, and either to establish a new definition of doctrine, or to shut out from her ministry, if not from her communion, all who do not construe her language in the same sense with themselves. And it is because this power could not be exercised without the consent of the State, and because there is not the remotest prospect that it will ever be conceded by the Legislature, that we hear murmurs of growing discontent, and longings more and more audibly whispered for a Free Church, and for the severance of ties which are regarded as shackles. It is very important that the real nature and meaning of these complaints and wishes should be clearly understood. This is not the place to discuss their reasonableness and justice. I will only observe, that much valuable light has of late been thrown upon this question. I wish that those who may have been perplexed and disquieted by a "History of Erastianism," which begins near the end of the subject, would, by way of supplement, study an account of it from another hand,* which carries the review back into a remote antiquity, and which furnishes evidence sufficient, I think, to convince every candid inquirer, that at all events we are not in this respect labouring under any new or peculiar grievance. I believe that learned and impartial writer

Another power is really aimed at, that of authoritative decision.

Which will never be conceded by the Legislature.

* "An Argument for the Royal Supremacy," by the Rev. Sanderson Robins.

has not said too much, when he asserts, that in this matter "we have on our side the voice of Scripture, the example of primitive practice, and the words of pious and learned men in the earliest ages, as well as in our own." And I trust that many of those who have been misled to crave an impracticable redress of an imaginary wrong, will yet feel the weight of his grave and seasonable warning: "When we determine to find elsewhere that independence of the civil power, which Christians in ages wiser and better than our own never desired to attain, we lay open our faith to a danger under which we can the less expect divine deliverance, because we bring it upon ourselves." For my own part, I cheerfully accept my full share of all the obloquy incurred by those who shrink from the responsibility of exposing the Church to such a danger.

For, whatever may be the secret springs of these movements, no one, I think, who does not wilfully shut his eyes, can fail to see which way they are tending, and what the party is whose hopes they nourish, and whose ends they are adapted, I would fain believe quite undesignedly on the part of most of those who are engaged in them, but still not the less surely, to serve. It is impossible to think of them without being reminded of the new attitude which Romanism has lately taken up in this country, and of the questions relating to it which occupied so large a share of public attention during the last session of Parliament. As I have already had several opportunities of expressing my sentiments on this subject, it will be the less necessary that I should now dwell upon it much. But there are a few points connected with it, as to which I think it right on this occasion briefly to state my views. The assent which I gave to the measure brought in by the Government, in accordance with the general wish, the demand, I may say, of the nation, to meet an extraordinary exertion of usurped or pretended authority on the part of the Pope, this assent I gave simply as an English subject, and on the same grounds on which the measure might be, and was supported by Roman Catholic members of the Legislature. Considering it in

Romish aggression. The Ecclesiastical Titles Bill.

this point of view, I thought, and am still persuaded, that the act of the Pope was a clear violation of the rights of the civil power, and one which, even independently of the circumstances which had drawn the eyes of all Europe upon it, it was not consistent either with honour or policy to pass over in silence, but which called for some proceeding of the Legislature to mark its real character. That it was required to satisfy any spiritual wants of the English Roman Catholics, or that they had not previously enjoyed the freest exercise of their religion, could hardly be pretended in the face of notorious facts. That it was necessary for the full development of their religion, may in one sense be true; but it would remain to be shown that there was any necessity for such a development, or that the question, whether it was necessary or not, might be safely left to their own judgment. Should such a principle be admitted, I believe that it would soon be discovered that this development also required the removal of all the restraints which are still imposed by our constitution and laws on the profession of that religion, and on the public exhibition of its rites and ceremonies; as indeed the more ardent of its professors make no secret of their determination never to rest until the last traces of our Protestant institutions have been abolished. The suppression of all the ancient Sees of England and Wales was but a link in the chain of that assumed necessity, of which a foreign prelate was to be the supreme arbiter; though even the history of the Popes furnishes, I believe, only one example of a similar proceeding, in the reorganization of the Gallican episcopate at the beginning of the present century, effected by a stretch of papal authority so unprecedented, that it produced a temporary schism, but at the instance and with the aid of the civil power. And it would seem that if the State had sufficient interest in those Sees to forbid the unauthorized assumption of their titles, it was still more concerned not passively to acquiesce in their total suppression. On such grounds I conceive that this proceeding was correctly described as an arrogant aggression on the dignity and independence of the Imperial Crown of this realm, which it was right and fit to repel. The course which it was most advisable to

take for this purpose, is another question, into which it would be needless and improper for me now to enter. Only I may observe, that whatever might be my opinion of the measure finally adopted, I could not regret that tenderness of religious liberty which retarded its progress, and led to what many consider as an imperfect and unsatisfactory result.

Regard for the rights of conscience in others.

But viewing it in another light, with regard to the interests of our Church, so far as these interests are in this matter distinct from those of the State, I have only been anxious that nothing should be done or said in behalf or in the name of the Church, that could justly incur the imputation or suspicion of intolerance, or in any way weaken the force of the contrast which it is our privilege to witness, between the liberty enjoyed by our Roman Catholic fellow-subjects, and the restraints imposed on the profession of the reformed faith, wherever the Church of Rome holds undivided sway. And it is gratifying to me to reflect, that neither in this Diocese nor elsewhere, have the Clergy laid themselves open to such a charge. The firmest assertions of their own principles, which have been drawn from them by recent occurrences, have been tempered by the fullest recognition of the rights of conscience in others. If they had been provoked into acting otherwise, they, and in a measure the cause of the Church, would indeed have sustained very serious hurt from the Roman aggression. But from any other kind of injury which it threatened, the Church neither needed nor could receive protection through any measures which might be adopted by the Legislature. And although it was both natural and fitting, that the Clergy should on this occasion express their sympathy with the feelings which animated so large a part of the community, I could not see that it called for any formal protest or declaration from them, or that their position could be at all strengthened by such a proceeding. If it was addressed to the author of the aggression or his followers, it was quite certain that it would either be received with disdainful silence, or draw forth an offensive retort. If meant for other eyes, such a document must, one would think, by this time,

have become superfluous. The Church of England is herself a living protest, her Articles a standing declaration, against both the usurped jurisdiction and the corrupt doctrine of the Bishop of Rome. Simply to denounce the late intrusion as schismatical, seems to me either more or less than the occasion required. And I am not sure that what was meant as a protest, if made on ground which might be taken by those who hold all Roman doctrine, would not be likely to be interpreted as a concession. At the best it could only be thought to reprove the intemperate zeal of those who would withhold the name of a Christian Church from the Roman communion.

Significance of Papal assumption.

There can however be little doubt that the real significance of the recent exhibition of Papal power carried to its utmost length in a country where the full extent of its claims had been well-nigh forgotten, lies in the confidence which it betokens, on the part of its authors, in the resources and prospects of their cause. I shall not now inquire into the causes which may have conspired to produce or to cherish this confidence; in what degree it may have been strengthened by the disposition which has been shown by the Legislature and the Government, to grant to Roman Catholics the largest measure of indulgence which it was possible for them to enjoy under a Protestant constitution, or by the Romanizing tendency which has been manifested within our own Church. That both of these causes have contributed toward the result can hardly be questioned; though the proportion in which each has contributed to it can only be matter of uncertain surmise. It still remains to be seen how far that confidence was well grounded, and whether the display which has been made of it, has strengthened or weakened the foundation, whatever that may be, on which it rests. But in itself it certainly cannot in any way affect our condition, though the manner in which it has been exhibited may, and ought to put us on our guard. It is in a similar light, that is, as symptoms which demand our most serious attention, but not as of any grave moment in themselves, that I regard the secessions which have lately taken place from among

us to the Church of Rome. Painful and saddening indeed they are on many accounts, and not least for the melancholy spectacle which they exhibit, of fine minds undergoing the judicial penalty of misdirected powers in their visible continual degradation. But what appears to me most disheartening in them is not their number, nor the station and personal qualities of some among the seceders, but the levity, the want of earnestness, which has been betrayed by persons from whom it was reasonable to expect a little more sobriety and stedfastness. I know it may be said that several of these persons have proved the depth of their conviction by the sacrifices they have made to their new professions; sacrifices, the cost of which, I am aware, is not to be measured by any amount of worldly advantage, and which to others might have appeared greater than that of life itself. These indeed are sufficient evidence of a very sincere and decided predilection, as to which there had been previously, in most cases, little room for doubt; but they cannot be admitted as proof of an intelligent conviction; and no other has yet been produced. It would seem as if the change was accounted either of so slight importance, or of so manifest propriety, as to require neither explanation nor defence; as if the ancient topics of controversy between our Church and the Church of Rome, which had so long exercised the most powerful minds in each, and had filled so many learned volumes, had become obsolete and trivial, and were no longer worthy of a word or a thought: not even from those who had been led by their sacred calling to make these matters the subject of their peculiar study. Even by such persons a difference of opinion within the Church, on a point quite extrinsic to that controversy, and which could hardly be said to have been fully discussed, is held to be a sufficient plea for abandoning the communion in which they had been brought up, and had both worshipped and ministered during a great part of their lives, and for at once accepting all the conditions exacted by the Church of Rome from those who seek to be reconciled with her. Certainly, however eminent may be the abilities and the character of the persons who

Secessions to the Church of Rome.

A plea for them.

quit us on such grounds, it would be doing dishonour to the cause of truth, to think that the Church has been weakened by such desertions. Indeed they are more apt to suggest reflections of quite a different kind, though scarcely less mournful. For when we see by what frail and precarious ties those whom we have lost were attached to the Church in which they had so long laboured, we can hardly help feeling a painful misgiving as to the character and tendency of their previous ministrations, which, by causes apparently so inadequate, were so abruptly brought to an end. We know indeed that they must have been thoroughly alienated, not only in belief, but in their principles of conduct, from the Church to which they outwardly belonged, if, after they had secretly renounced her faith, they continued to serve at her altars, and this for the purpose of drawing others away from her; but we are not sure that they would have been doing any thing for which they might not find a warrant and sanction in the Church which they have entered, and that would not there be regarded as a meritorious sacrifice.

The foundation of our Church unshaken.

Be this as it may, we have at least the comfort to be sure, that nothing has happened in the slightest degree to unsettle the foundation on which our Church has rested, either before or since the time when it was freed from those corruptions which it contracted in the course of its mediæval development, and which, through the calamitous issue of the Council of Trent, have been to all appearance permanently fastened on the modern Church of Rome. The scriptural and historical groundworks of our position are independent of all the shifting currents of opinion. The Church of Rome has no such security against perpetual and indefinite change. It is subject to an authority which has repeatedly exercised and constantly claims the right to introduce the most important innovations into its creed. It is on the very ground that our Church acknowledges no such supreme authority, that some have professed to be dissatisfied with her guidance, and have sought certainty and rest in the bosom of one which can refer all disputes to an infallible living oracle. This supposed

privilege is the principle by the aid of which the ablest and most learned among them has endeavoured to vindicate both his own consistency, and the additions which have been made by Rome to the apostolical rule of faith. Yet the theory, according to his view so indispensable for this purpose, by which he would compendiously supersede all the controversies which had been occasioned by those novelties,—this theory is so far from being universally admitted in his new communion as an unquestionable truth, that it is there denounced by others as an error subversive of the Christian faith.* And between these conflicting views, which concern, not this or that point of doctrine, but the very foundation of the whole religion, the oracle is silent, and, it is not presuming too much to say, will never venture to pronounce a definite judgment. For it is well aware that its influence depends on the obscurity and uncertainty in which the limits of its authority are shrouded. It confidently asserts its own infallibility, but it is too prudent formally to condemn those who hold the opposite opinion. In the Church of Rome at least, the nature and attributes of the final court of appeal, in matters of faith, is, and apparently always must be, an open question.

Unchangeable truth the strength of the Church.

It is, I believe, in the contemplation of that truth which is not merely a deposit entrusted to the Church's keeping, but is the mould in which she is cast, and to which she owes her distinctive form and character, a truth which cannot be affected either by any vicissitudes in her outward condition, or even by the infirmity or the faithlessness of those who hold it in unrighteousness—it is I say in the contemplation of this unchangeable truth, that we have to seek for comfort in this time of trouble, and also for our only effectual remedy and safeguard against the evils which either afflict or threaten our Church. Surely in itself it is adequate to both these ends, and only needs to be sufficiently known, valued, trusted, and put in use. If we prize it in any degree

* See the note 6, p. 3, of the late Rev. W. A. Butler's admirable "Letters on the Development of Christian Doctrine in reply to Mr. Newman's Essay:" a work which ought to be in the library of every student of Divinity.

according to its worth, we must at least believe that it will not merely serve as an outward badge of unity, but will exert its power in the knitting together both of hearts and minds in its service. And then we need not be much alarmed or disquieted either by the inroads of Romish proselytism, or by any other kind of outward assault; and though some should go out from us who were not of us, we may hope that those who remain will be all the more stedfast and devoted to the truth. Any other reliance could only disappoint and deceive us to our hurt. And therefore I think we may be in danger of ascribing too much importance to that which many seem so eagerly to desire, the enforcing of more stringent regulations for uniformity in the ceremonies of public worship. I do not mean to deny that such measures may be seasonable and useful: but none that are merely coercive can do more than heal our hurt slightly: and we must beware of overrating their efficacy, and of saying *Peace: peace: where there is no peace.* It behoves us carefully to distinguish between two widely different classes of cases. Many, by far the greater part at least, it is to be hoped, of those among our brethren who have introduced liturgical innovations, which they perhaps believe to be harmless and edifying, and to be authorized by the laws of the Church, though at variance with the practice of later times, but which are now more than ever offensive and suspicious to others, who are with good reason jealous of every appearance of a Romanizing tendency—most of these, I say, are, we may trust, nevertheless sound and firm in their adherence to the principles of our reformed faith. With such persons we should wish to deal with the utmost gentleness and forbearance, and if possible to win them over to a more discreet and charitable course by the language of sober and affectionate remonstrance. With this view I gladly concurred in the address of the Bishops to the Clergy of the provinces of Canterbury and York on this subject, which, it was hoped, where it fell on minds open to conviction, proceeding as it did from those whose godly admonitions they were bound to respect, might induce many spontaneously to retrace their steps. I have some reason to believe

Forbearance to be shown.

that this measure has not been fruitless, and I certainly do not think the worse of it, or augur from it the less hopefully, on account of the disapprobation it has incurred from those who are more anxious for the triumph of a party, than for the peace of the Church.

Deliberate attempts to Romanize within the Church.

There may however be cases of another kind. There may be persons who are exercising the ministry of the Church with a deliberate purpose of drawing away as many as they can into the Church of Rome, or, which amounts in the end to the same thing, of leavening their own, as far as the sphere of their influence extends, with Romish doctrine, and who endeavour to accommodate the forms of public worship to that design. There was a time when we should have thought such cases incredible. We may still trust that they are very rare: but recent disclosures forbid us to doubt that they have actually occurred. We should of course most anxiously desire to put a stop to such a mischief, but it is one against which it would be difficult to devise any effectual safeguard, and it is evidently quite beyond the reach of Articles, Canons, and Rubrics, and of any exercise of lawful authority. But we have so much the more room to comfort ourselves with the assurance, that this evil cannot continue long to afflict the Church. Such duplicity is too repugnant to our feelings, habits, and principles, and can only damage the cause which it is intended to serve. It is indeed no more than might be expected to occur now and then in a season of feverish excitement, when the doctrine of pious fraud has gained admittance into minds so constituted or perverted, that the fundamental truths of Christianity appear to them to rest on no firmer basis, than the latest miraculous legend of Italian imposture and credulity. This Antinomian fanaticism is no new thing under the sun: but it is a thing of foreign growth, and the system to which it belongs will, we humbly trust, never take root in our soil.

But yet this would be a hollow delusive comfort, if the Church should rest content with the mere possession or assertion of the

truth. For it is not by dint of controversy, any more than by penal enactments, or protests, or declarations, that the efforts of Romish proselytism are to be repelled. I do not mean that it is not very important, and a duty at this juncture peculiarly incumbent on those who are bound by their office, not only to be "ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh them a reason of the hope that is in them," but as far as lies in them to guard their brethren from being led astray by the wiles of the adversary, that they should be thoroughly conversant with the history and principles of our controversy with the Church of Rome. And I would especially caution my younger brethren in the ministry, not to fancy that they will be sufficiently furnished for this part of their work by a few traditional notions and arguments, which they may have picked up without any special study of the subject. We possess indeed, through the learned labours of those who have gone before us, an armoury richly stored with weapons for every point of this contest: and they have of late been brought within the reach of many to whom they were before hardly accessible.* But this will be of no avail to those who will not take the pains to draw them forth, and to learn their use. But still, this, as I have intimated, is not the quarter from which cometh our help. The adversary's strength lies not in the appeals which he addresses to the understanding, but in the arts with which he eludes the necessity of making any. His policy is to give the most unbounded latitude for the wildest abuse of private judgment to those who are undecided on the abstract question, the choice of a Church, but

The mere assertion of truth not sufficient.

The Policy of Popery.

* I allude especially to the republication of Bishop Gibson's "Preservative from Popery" by the Reformation Society. This very useful collection however does not contain, and cannot supersede, Jeremy Taylor's "Dissuasive from Popery," and his wonderful work "On the Real Presence," or Barrow's "Treatise on the Pope's Supremacy." Some useful pieces are to be found in the compilation entitled "The Churchman armed against the errors of the time." Among later manuals may be recommended the Cambridge reprint of Archbishop Usher's "Answer to a Jesuit," Bishop Hopkins's "On the Church of Rome," and, as an introduction to one of the most important parts of the subject, the history of the Council of Trent, Cramp's "Text-book of Popery." To these all who can should add the late Mr. Tyler's works, "On Christian Worship," and "The Romish Worship of the Virgin."

to forbid all exercise of it on particular doctrines to those who have once been drawn, though by the shallowest sophistry, into his toils, and to exact the most absolute unquestioning submission to the Church's authority in all that it propounds and enjoins. Men are first invited to believe, and then required to learn and repeat what their belief is, without inquiring whether the matter is to be found in the Bible or the Breviary.

The work of the Church.

It is not in this way then that the truth must put forth its power, if it is to make or keep us free; not in word, but in deed; not so much making itself heard as seen and felt: and this chiefly in the quiet regular working of the Church. Whether it be needful or not that new channels should be opened for her agency, the more profitable labour will probably always be that which is employed in clearing, deepening, and widening the old, that they may carry a purer and fuller stream of spiritual blessings over our land. In this work all the members of our Church, in their several orders and degrees, may and ought to bear a part. What the time calls for above all things, is a clearer view and a deeper sense of its urgency and obligation, and a more earnest purpose of devoting our best faculties to it, as to their highest end. But all the fruits of the most active zeal will be lost, and it will only aggravate our difficulties and dangers, if it is not tempered with the spirit of brotherly charity. The hopes of our adversaries are grounded, not upon our indifference or supineness, but upon our unhappy intestine divisions: upon our mutual jealousies, suspicions, and misunderstandings: upon the prevalence of an unchristian party spirit, which coins nicknames and watchwords for the purpose of exciting and perpetuating strife and ill-will, which distorts and perverts the most innocent expressions and actions: which magnifies differences, and widens breaches: which blinds men of opposite sides to one another's worth, and neutralizes their separate efforts for the common good. To the workings of this unholy spirit those who are longing and striving for the downfall of the Church, are looking with the most sanguine expectations for the accomplishment of their wishes: this spirit they are labouring, openly and

secretly, by the machinations of avowed and unavowed emissaries, to foment and propagate. We know not how much of its operation is their work, but we may be sure that all tends to second their designs. If then our duty was not clear enough in itself, it is so plainly marked out for us by the words and acts of our adversaries, that we have no excuse for mistaking or neglecting it. They warn us that disunion is the evil and the danger against which we have now to put ourselves on our guard, and in comparison with which all others of this our day are slight and unimportant. They admonish us that our safety lies in the observance of the Apostolic precept: to "*follow after the things which make for peace, and things wherewith one may edify another.*" And it is our happiness to know, that in our case, at least, these are not two different kinds of things which must share our attention between them, but the undivided object of one and the same pursuit. The things wherewith one may edify another, comprehend the whole circle of our Christian duties, and the broad ground of our Church fellowship. The things which give occasion to discord, are those which are most remotely, if at all, connected with any purposes of mutual edification. That is the very cause why they are so apt to perplex and divide those who are agreed on the weightier matters of faith and practice. And thus we are furnished with a sure test, by which we may try things of a doubtful aspect, which may be set before us in a time fruitful of new devices. Our first question should be, whether they are things which make for peace, and which are suited to the use of edifying. If not, it will be best that we should put them aside, at least until a more convenient season. And it may well be doubted, whether new party bands, and unions which multiply division, are likely to help us toward keeping the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace.

There are some other topics on which I should, under ordinary circumstances, have been tempted to offer a few remarks; as the present position and prospects of the educational question, which appear to me both to illustrate the mischiefs and dangers I have been noticing, and to afford a cheering token

of the prevalence of a better spirit. I might also have adverted, with more than a passing word, to the third Jubilee of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, which has been celebrated this year under the happiest auspices, and with the prospect of great permanent benefit to the missionary cause. I have the less need to dwell upon this subject, because I shall have occasion to draw your attention to it in a more special manner, for the purpose of inviting your co-operation in the work. I would now allude to it only as one of those labours of love, which are at this juncture doubly precious, because they bring men together upon common ground. But I wish to conclude with what seems to me, under our present circumstances, the point of supreme importance, and almost the one thing needful. It was probably with no more urgent motive that, according to a credible tradition, the beloved Disciple who closed his pastoral Epistle with the admonition, *Keep yourselves from idols*, summed up his apostolical teaching with the simple repetition of the new commandment, *Love one another*. At a time when blind partisanship is the chief source of discord, both precepts are equally seasonable, and fall in with one another. Darker clouds have hung over the Church, and have rolled away, or dropped their burden in quickening showers. The danger of that which is now lowering, lies not so much in itself, as in the spirit which would call down fire from heaven. This is a spirit which not only disturbs the peace of the Church, but interrupts and retards her proper action. In proportion as it prevails, there will be much stir, but little progress: frequent fits of convulsive energy, but few tokens of healthy vigour. Some persons, whose opinions are entitled to the highest respect, believe that the best way to cast out this spirit, is to give it the freest vent and the amplest opportunities of exerting itself. That is a point on which experience alone can decide. But at all events this is no more than a wish, a hope, a project, about which some are more sanguine and confident than others. What I am now insisting on is of a more immediately practical nature. I am not recommending indifference or inertness. The *river, the streams*

The spirit in which the work of the Church should be done.

whereof are to make glad the city of God, though its *waters roar not nor are troubled*, yet does not stagnate, but pursues an even though noiseless course. What I am urging is a double measure of quiet, steady activity, concentrated on the regular, ordinary, undisputed work of the Church. I am recommending to each, in his appointed sphere, be it large or narrow, that, which if it was made the common study of all, would most effectually counteract the working of the spirit of discord and self-will, and would be most likely to bring it into captivity to the obedience of Christ. Without this, it would be but the expression of a vain and impotent longing, to say, *Who will show us any good?* With this, there is no good which we may not reasonably hope to have added unto us; no evil—none certainly that man can do unto us—that we have need to fear. And this, my Reverend Brethren, is something which is placed both in your power and in your way; something for which you have constant occasion, and ever-recurring opportunities. Your churches, your schools, the dwellings of the poor, the chambers of the sick, the ignorant, the erring, the careless, the weak-hearted—these you have always with you. If these objects of your pastoral care should so engross both your time and thoughts, as to leave you none to spare for taking a part in those contentions with which others are almost wholly occupied, I am sure that you will not be the less happy, I believe that you will not be the less useful: useful, I mean, not simply within the prescribed range of your ministerial labours, but, though it may be unconsciously and undesignedly, to the Church at large. In them you will find the answer of a good conscience, the peace of God resting with yourselves. Through them, while you make full proof of your ministry, you will help, each in his measure and degree, to draw down upon the Church the blessing of peace.

APPENDIX.

PAGE 146.

A NOTE appended to a "Speech of Sir B. Hall, Bart., M.P., in the House of Commons, Tuesday, July 1st, 1851, on the motion of the Marquis of Blandford, M.P., for Church Extension out of the Resources of the Established Church,"—which has been published in the form of a pamphlet, PRICE ONE PENNY,—contains the following statements with regard to the condition of certain churches in the Diocese of St. David's. These statements are described as extracts from the reports of the author's "own commissioners," received "only a few months ago."

"Llangybi, four miles from Llanbedr College, has neither doors nor windows. The Sacrament has not been administered for TEN years. Service seldom performed at all. Cows and horses walk into the church and out at pleasure."

This church, which I visited in person early in the summer of 1849, was indeed then in a very dilapidated state: but early in the following year it had been completely repaired. The communicants had been previously in the habit of attending the neighbouring church of Llanfair-clydogau, which is held by the same incumbent with Llangybi.

"Llanfihangel-ar-Arth, also near Llanbedr. Here there was once a chapel of ease, the stones of its ruins have now disappeared, though a yew-tree marks the spot; and the baptismal font was lately seen used as a pig-trough. Yet the Dissenters have five chapels, and congregations amounting to 1200."

This statement is, no doubt, designed to convey the supposition, without which it would be utterly irrelevant, that the Church of England has at present no place of worship in this parish. It however possesses a good and well-filled church, and if further accommodation should be required, no one probably would think of rebuilding the ancient chapel for that purpose.

"Llandeilo Fach. No service here for about TEN years. The roof has fallen down for several years, but fortunately there is a Dissenting chapel, with a congregation of about 300."

The honesty of this statement may be partly appreciated from the simple fact, that in the Churchwardens' Return to my Articles of Visitation for this year, this church is stated to have been in ruins ever since 1831. I am, however, assured by a person thoroughly acquainted with the country, that it was in ruins at least as far back as 1825. It must be added, that it stands at a moderate distance from two other churches which are held by the same incumbent.

The motive for suppressing these facts, and for printing the number *ten* in capitals, needs not be pointed out.

"Llanboidy. The church has been for years without doors or windows, and the service seldom performed.

"Llandowror. This church has now no roof to its chancel, of which it has been destitute several years. The churchyard has neither wall nor fence: sheep were seen standing on the church tower some months ago."

With regard to these two cases, I subjoin an extract from a letter of the Rev. John Evans, Vicar of Llanboidy, and Rural Dean, to whom I sent a copy of the penny pamphlet. It is dated August 1, 1851.

"Llanboidy. The church has been for years without doors or windows, and the service seldom performed."

"I cannot imagine any set of men commissioned to inquire into the condition of the churches could have ventured to proclaim to the world so serious a charge of neglect of duty, unless they had received the information from some one who wished to impose on their credulity. It is impossible for me to think there could have been a personal visit on the part of the commissioners, for the church itself was an existing proof against the imputation. Since 1827 I have been resident Vicar, living in the parish of Llanboidy, and from that period to the present the service has been regularly and faithfully performed, not only on Sundays, but also on week days, and I have always preached both in English and Welsh for the benefit of the mixed congregation. Some hundreds attend at every service, and the communicants number between 90 and 100. In 1846 a new gallery was erected in the church, with 120 free sittings, which are well filled every Sunday; and contiguous to the church are two school-rooms, attended daily and on Sundays by 80 or 100 boys and girls. When I came into the parish in 1827, the church was a decent building, but of late years it has been much improved and enlarged, and may be now classed among the best fabrics in the country. But there was no omission of duty during the time the repairs were carried on, for divine service was constantly performed in one of the adjoining school-rooms.

"Llandowror. The same commissioners have taken a license not warranted by facts, with regard to this parish. The chancel had a new

substantial roof put on about fourteen years ago, which has been, and is, as I visited the place yesterday, in good repair, and the churchyard has both a wall and fence. Three sheep were seen eating the ivy on the church tower last year, about the month of June, but how they got there no one could give me any idea. There was a mason working in the church, and the door was open, which left a passage to the tower, but how sheep ever ascended is to me a mystery, as it was with difficulty I and two others reached the top."

I can confirm the accuracy of Mr. Evans's statements with regard to the churches from repeated personal inspection, without which it would be impossible to form an adequate notion of the dishonesty of the misrepresentations to which they refer.

In justice to another of my Clergy, I feel myself bound to notice one more statement in the same note, though relating to a different subject.

"Llanwnen with Silian, vacant a few months ago. The Bishop of St. David's appointed one of the tutors of Llanbedr College to the living as officiating minister for both, who of course cannot attend to either during the week, and has no curates. The attendance sometimes averages ten persons, but at other times consists of only the parson and clerk."

The incumbent (the Rev. D. Williams) states in a letter which I received from him in August last: "Ever since the charge of the parishes devolved upon me, I have had three special duties some three evenings in every week, including both parishes: and there never has been a week, unless I happened to be from home, but I have visited some part of them, and I have resided in the vicarage-house since about the twenty-fourth of May. As for attendance, Silian has not only had more than ten, but for years more than treble the number of communicants; the attendance has filled, quite filled the church for a couple of years: I have even had complaints made to me of want of room. And as for Llanwnen, for the last three months it has been generally full."

The mass of calumnious falsehoods here exposed does not bear the names of the makers, but only that of the person to whose order it was furnished, and the exposure has no chance of reaching those among whom the calumny has been circulated. But it seemed right, for the sake of others, that the truth should be placed on record.

V.

A CHARGE

DELIVERED SEPTEMBER AND OCTOBER, 1854.

CONVOCATION.—CHURCH RATES.—CONFIRMATION.—WILBERFORCE'S DOCTRINE OF THE EUCHARIST.

MY REVEREND BRETHREN,

WHEN I last addressed you on a like occasion, there was so much in the aspect of things around us to disquiet and depress the friends of the Church, that I felt it my duty to point your attention to the brighter side of our condition and prospects. I know that I was thought by some to have taken a more hopeful view of our situation, and to have spoken in a tone of greater confidence, than was fully warranted by the circumstances of the case. With regard, however, to the main causes of the uneasiness —not to say the alarm—which then prevailed in many minds, the language which I held appears to have been justified by the event. The apprehensions which had been excited by the aggressive attitude then recently taken up by the Church of Rome in this country, in connexion with our internal dissensions, have gradually died away: and it seems to be generally admitted that much of what looked at the time so formidable has been overruled for our good. In the interval which has since elapsed no fresh occasion of similar anxiety has occurred. The worst effect of every such temporary excitement is that it diverts attention from matters of greater and more lasting moment, and commonly leaves the public mind in a state of apathy and languor. We have much reason to be thankful for

the continued enjoyment of a period of comparative tranquillity, when questions affecting the interests of the Church may be discussed as calmly and freely as the difference of opinion on such subjects is ever likely to permit.

It has been my practice on these occasions to draw your attention to such questions, though not immediately concerning our own diocese, and to state my views of them. It has always appeared to me that one of the chief benefits of our meetings would be lost, if they might not serve to quicken the sense of our relation, not only to one another, and to the local field of our common ministrations, but to the Church at large. It has, indeed, been suggested* that such addresses ought only to speak the language of official authority, and not to be made the vehicle of any private opinions or personal views. I am content to bear the responsibility of purposely disregarding this rule, so long as you do not suspect me of wishing to impose my opinions upon you under the seal of official authority, or of proposing them to you with any other object than that they may be subjected to the most searching inquiry, and the freest discussion. In the present instance, the topic which has of late occupied the thoughts of Churchmen above every other is one of the highest practical moment in every part of the Church alike; one on which it is desirable that every clergyman should be qualified to form a deliberate judgment, as none can know how long it may be before he is called upon to act with regard to it, in the exercise of one of his most important privileges. You will at once have understood me to be speaking of the revival—as it is called—of Convocation. And I am the rather induced to devote some portion of our time to this subject, because I wish both to clear away some misapprehensions as to the observations I made on it in my last Charge, and to explain how far the views which I then entertained have been modified, not so much by farther consideration and inquiry—though, if this has been in any degree the case, I should most readily acknowledge it—as by the course of subsequent events,

The Revival of Convocation.

* By Canon Trevor, "The Two Convocations," p. 209, on occasion, however, of two Charges which expressed views at variance with his own.

and the change which they seem to me to have made in the position and bearings of the question.

It has surprised me to find that those observations have been so greatly misunderstood, and in a quarter where I could scarcely have thought such a mistake possible, as to have suggested the belief that they were prompted by a desire "to alarm and prejudice the public mind," * and by a hope "that, terrified by the prospect of a great organic change," the Church would permit herself to sink into the position of "a mere machine, or passive instrument of the higher will of the State." † I should have thought that, independently of the distinct avowal which I made of my sympathy with the wish that had been expressed for the renewal of synodical action, the general tenor of my remarks would have secured me from such an imputation, and have satisfied every candid mind that, however I might have been in error as to the ground of the objections which I put forward, I had not sought to exaggerate their force, but had rather been swayed by it against the leaning of my own inclination. I have also been charged with having used language amounting to an infringement of the 139th Canon, which denounces the penalty of excommunication on every one who shall affirm "that the sacred synod of this nation, in the name of Christ and by the King's authority assembled, is not the true Church of England by representation." I had, indeed, ventured to observe that no "Convocation hitherto known to our Church has the slightest claim to the character of a national synod, or of an assembly representing even the English branch of the Anglican communion," and that "our Convocations not only do not represent the Church in either of the two English provinces, but could no longer be allowed for any practical purposes to represent the clergy." But the inconsistency which some persons have thought they perceived between this remark and the language of the Canon will disappear on a closer inspection. I apprehend that it was not the intention of the framers to bind any one to recognise

A misunderstanding.

An apparent inconsistency reconciled.

* Trevor, "The Two Convocations," p. 213.

† Ibid. p. 10.

the completeness or adequacy of the form in which the Church was represented, but simply to affirm two propositions, one that the Church represented in Convocation was the true Church of England, the other that the acts of the body by which it was represented were legal and valid. And to each of these propositions I have always given my hearty assent. The strongest opinion as to the need of reform in the constitution of a legislative assembly is perfectly consistent with the fullest admission of the legality of its proceedings. It may be doubted whether the word *Church* in the Canon means more than the spiritualty, of which it is said, in the preamble of the Act for the restraint of appeals, that it "is now usually called the English Church." But if it was used in the largest sense, then the assertion which the Canon makes it unlawful to contradict, manifestly refers to a kind of virtual representation very different from that of which I was speaking. As to the laity, the question has never been whether they are, but whether they ought to be really represented. And as to the clergy, the defect in their representation in the province of Canterbury is so patent, as to have been made the subject of a proposal for its amendment in a committee of Convocation itself. Nor can I admit that there was any thing fanciful or exaggerated in the fears which I expressed, and which were shared by many very sober-minded persons, lest a revived Convocation should become the arena of theological debates, which would tend to inflame the heat of party spirit, and to threaten the unity of the Church. Those fears did not arise, as has been erroneously, if not somewhat disingenuously represented, from a mere vague notion of the dangers incident to such assemblies at all times, nor from a want of due confidence in the discretion and moderation of the clergy in our own day. They were almost unavoidably suggested by then recent events, and by the notorious fact, that some of the persons who most strenuously advocated the revival of Convocation, avowedly looked to it as the only remedy for the injury which they conceived the Church to have suffered from the sanction which had been seemingly given in her name to unsound doctrine. These apprehensions would not have been

Fears of theological debates.

unreasonable even if subsequent experience had proved them to be groundless. I should be glad to believe that such has been the case. But I think it would be premature, even now, to treat the danger as chimerical, and not rather to be as much as ever on our guard against it. *

Repugnance to any departure from established usage.

It may be true that among those who have opposed the revival of Convocation there have been some who have been swayed by no better motive than a general instinctive repugnance to any departure from a long-established usage, though itself in its origin a violent innovation on a rule and practice of far higher antiquity and longer duration. There may have been others who, without weighing the change of circumstances which has taken place since the meeting of Convocation was reduced to an empty ceremony, regard the maintenance of this forced inaction as a traditional article of state policy, hitherto held sacred by all political parties, which no minister can abandon without forfeiting his reputation for statesmanship. And there are others again, some of them professedly friends of the Church, who have not scrupled to advocate the continuance of that policy, while they avowedly agree with those who represent it as degrading to the Church, and treat such degradation as the necessary price which she has to pay for the benefits she derives from her alliance with the State. But I do not believe that either the arguments or the authority of those who have approached the subject in such a spirit have had or are likely to have much influence on the public mind. With the clergy, and with all sincere and enlightened friends of the Church, the effect can have been only to prepossess them in favour of a measure which was resisted on such grounds.

* See a quotation from *The Ecclesiastic* for Nov. 1852, in note 2, p. 14, of the new edition of "A Letter to a Convocation Man," published by the Rev. W. Fraser. "What was it that caused the struggle for Convocation? . . . Was it not the monstrous guilt palpable to every one who cared to think what God and His Church mean—that a Parliament composed of all sorts of creeds . . . should have coolly delegated the Church's divine commission to a body springing from and to be composed of such elements as itself, to decide on the Holy Catholic Faith of Christ's Church in England?" On which the editor remarks, that these statements, "though expressed somewhat intemperately, are not untrue as far as fact goes."

The strongest prejudices which have been raised against it have probably been caused by the language and proceedings of its injudicious partisans. Some of these have appeared to assert its necessity as a demonstration of the freedom and independence of the Church, meaning thereby—as the whole tenor of their reasoning implied—no more than the clergy. Others have indicated that they desire it chiefly or solely for the sake of some ulterior object which they hesitate distinctly to avow. Its more prudent and temperate advocates have rested their plea in its behalf on the firmer and safer ground of some specific benefits which they look for from it; though they have too often failed to show either how it is to serve such ends, or why it is needed for them.

The work of Convocation.

This I believe to be the point on which the practical issue of the controversy will ultimately be found to turn: and that we may not deceive ourselves with visionary expectations, it is very important that we should endeavour to form as exact a notion as possible of the work which Convocation, if permitted to sit for the dispatch of business, would have to take in hand and be competent to perform. But still we ought not to overlook the fact that there are many who claim such permission as an inalienable right, one which no length of desuetude, nor any authority short of that of the entire legislature, can extinguish; as resting, according to one, and that the lowest view, on ground as firm as that which is the basis of our most precious civil rights and constitutional liberties; according to another, on a foundation still more sacred and inviolable, the same which underlies the essential constitution of the Church of Christ, and in its deepest origin is one with the will of the Church's divine Head. Such claims, I say, it can never be right or safe to overlook or ignore. To do so would be in us peculiarly unbecoming and unwise; for they appeal to that sense of justice and that reverence for religion which it is our special duty and interest to cherish; and if disregarded they must keep the minds of earnest men in a state of continual ferment and irritation most detrimental to the peace and prosperity of the Church. But it is evident that the examination of this part of

the subject involves the necessity of a historical retrospect, which alone can enable us to form a correct notion of the nature of the institution we are considering, and of its inherent rights and just privileges. Such a review may also be useful for other purposes, as it may help us to draw a lesson from the past for our admonition and guidance in the choice of the paths which now lie before us. But if for these reasons I venture to invite you to accompany me for a few moments into this field of inquiry, it is not because I am not aware both of its vast extent, and of the peculiar difficulties with which it is beset. Perhaps hardly any questions in our history are more entangled and perplexing than those which relate to the origin and early progress of Convocation. The subject is continually presenting itself under such an ambiguity of aspect as makes it very hard to seize the right point of view. The learned and laborious researches which have been spent upon it would not have been more than sufficient to unravel its intricacies, and to place it in its true light, even if they had been conducted with perfect impartiality. But, instituted as they have been for the most part under the influence of preconceived opinions and party feelings, they have often served rather to increase than to dispel the obscurity of the point in dispute. While I own my obligations to their authors, I trust that, in weighing their conclusions, I shall not have lost sight of the warning of their example.

The history of Convocation, in the proper sense of the word, is generally admitted to begin in the reign of Edward I. But it will not be irrelevant to our purpose, and indeed it is necessary for the sake of avoiding all unwarranted assumptions, to go back to a still more remote antiquity, and even to cast a glance at the institutions of the Anglo-Saxon Church. That period is singularly instructive, both for the resemblances and for the contrasts which it exhibits to the state of things in our own day. The Anglo-Saxon was a truly national Church; and, though not exempt from the natural and just influence of Rome, as at once its parent soil and the seat of a higher civilization, was free from the domination of the Papal power, and in several important par-

The Anglo-Saxon Church.

ticulars of faith and discipline preserved the order and spirit of earlier times. The most prominent feature in the history of this period—one which advantageously distinguishes it from all succeeding ages—is the intimate union which then subsisted between Church and State, undisturbed by jealousy or distrust, and which was displayed as well in the concurrence of the civil and ecclesiastical authority for the administration of justice, as in the mixed character of the national and provincial councils.* As the bishops and clergy took part in those which treated of secular matters, so on the other hand the sovereign frequently presided in person, accompanied by his nobles, in those which were convened for the transaction of purely ecclesiastical business, and the canons enacted in them were confirmed, or at least attested by the subscription of the lay assessors.

Constitution of its assemblies uncertain.

With regard, however, to the precise constitution of these assemblies, we must be content to remain in doubt on many interesting points. There appears to be evidence sufficient to render it highly probable, that both in those in which the object was purely secular, and those in which it was strictly spiritual, some members of the second order of the clergy were used to sit along with the bishops. And hence some writers, to lay the broader ground for their reasoning as to the law or usage of later times, have contended that the second order thus represented was a constituent member of the Anglo-Saxon parliaments and synods.

* Johnson, "Laws and Canons of the Church of England," in "Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology," Pref. p. xxx. observes, "Though the Saxon bishops had an unlimited power of making canons, yet we have many laws relating to matters merely spiritual, enacted by kings in their great councils or civil gemotes. This may seem to some to have been an intrenchment on the authority of the bishops. To this it has been answered (see Wake, 'Authority of Christian Princes,' &c., p. 160), that the bishops, without whom no great council was held, retired into a place by themselves in order to draw up and enact laws relating to religion, as was the practice in some neighbouring countries. And I will not deny that this might sometimes be done. Yet when I see here and there an ecclesiastical law interspersed among a great number of such as are purely temporal; at other times almost an equal number of ecclesiastical and civil laws, mutually succeeding each other in the same system; at other times two or three ecclesiastical laws dropped into a set of temporal, and *vice versâ* temporal among ecclesiastical, I am inclined to believe that both sort of laws were made by an amicable conjunction of both powers."

But this inference does not seem to me to be borne out by the premisses. We may readily admit that, more especially in the ecclesiastical councils, the presence of the inferior clergy might answer many very important purposes; that they assisted the prelates with their information and advice; that their attendance heightened the solemnity of a synod, and that the expression of their assent gave additional weight to its decrees. But from all this it would not follow that they were an integral element in its constitution, so that it could not be lawfully convened without them: nor that, when present, they were admitted to an equal share in its debates; nor that their subscription was requisite for the validity of any of its acts. There can scarcely be a doubt that the legislative authority resided in the episcopal order, though in the exercise of their functions they availed themselves of such aid as circumstances offered, and the occasion appeared to require.*

A period favourable to ecclesiastical legislation.

The records of these councils suggest yet another observation. The Anglo-Saxon period, after the hierarchy had been constituted by Archbishop Theodore in subordination to the see of Canterbury, was eminently favourable to ecclesiastical legislation. Synods were commonly regarded as the main organs of the Church's life, and their frequent and regular assembling, prescribed by her ancient laws, as essential to her well-being. In them was gathered, as in a focus, all the intelligence and knowledge of the age. The authority of their decrees was unquestioned, and sustained by the harmonious co-operation of the clergy and the laity. And though their periodical recurrence was often interrupted by the disturbed state of the country, the same cause afforded the more abundant

* There is no reason for questioning the correctness of the doctrine laid down in Lyndwood's gloss on Archbishop Arundel's Constitution. "Aliorum Prælatorum, sc. Abbatum Decanorum et Archidiaconorum: Præsentium; non dicit Vocatorum: quia ad Provinciale Concilium non sunt Vocandi, ex necessitate, nisi Episcopi. Si tamen alii veniant admittendi sunt: imo vocandi sunt quando de eorum Factis agitur, vel quia eorum consilium est necessarium." Atterbury, "Rights of Convocation," p. 11, assails it with most frivolous and disingenuous cavils, though it may be hoped really not understanding its meaning, which is very well explained and vindicated by Kennett ("Ecclesiastical Synods," p. 41) and Wake ("State of the Church," p. 306).

matter for their deliberations. Yet if we inquire into the real efficacy of their synodical action, as tested by its practical results, we find reason to suspect that it was either very slight in proportion to its outward display, or more powerful for evil than for good. It would indeed be unfair to expect that they should have risen above their age, and have been awakened to a premature consciousness of the corruptions which were overgrowing the doctrine, ritual, and practices of the Church. It was perhaps unavoidable that in this respect they should simply reflect the character and be carried along with the tendencies of their time. They were not, however, merely passive. They contributed by the weight of their authority to aggravate the evil of the prevailing ignorance and superstition. Among the documents belonging to this period which bear the name of canons, many are but a renewal of older well-known but neglected ordinances; others simply pastoral exhortations or admonitions, from which their authors can hardly have expected any very important results. They must at least have been conscious that the effect would entirely depend on the zeal and diligence which they might themselves exert, each in his separate sphere of action. With the largest measure of success, the operation of their enactments would have been for the most part only restrictive and coercive; but they manifestly failed to accomplish even this object. One of the most signal proofs of their inability to enforce their decrees, appears in the indulgence which they were constrained to yield to wealthy transgressors, by the commutation of bodily austerities for pecuniary payments, and the admission of a vicarious penance, which, while it removed the terrors of ecclesiastical discipline from the worst offenders, and gave a virtual licence to the grossest sins, struck at the root of all personal religion, and reduced the practical test of repentance to a purely mechanical process, which might be as effectually performed by another as by the penitent himself.

The Policy of the Conqueror.

The main object of the Conqueror's policy with regard to the Church was to use its power as an instrument for establishing his dominion and crushing the national spirit in his

new subjects, and its wealth to replenish his exchequer. With this view he ejected the native clergy from the posts of chief dignity and influence, and filled them with his own countrymen; separated the ecclesiastical from the civil jurisdiction, and subjected the possessions of the higher order in the hierarchy to the burdens of the feudal tenure. But the ultimate tendency of his measures, which he could hardly have discerned, and certainly did not contemplate, was completely to sever all the remaining ties of sympathy and common interest between the clergy and the people, and to erect the former into an estate independent of the civil power, and subject and devoted to the rule of a stranger. The bitter fruits of this policy became visible a few generations later, in the contests which ended in the degradation of the crown and kingdom to a state of vassalage and submission to the arbitrary exactions of the see of Rome. The clergy discovered, when it was too late, that they themselves were the chief sufferers from the false position into which they had been brought, and that their divided allegiance only multiplied their burdens, while it detracted from their legitimate influence, and endangered their rightful possessions. Their foreign ecclesiastical sovereign, while he drained them of their wealth to satisfy his own cupidity, did not protect them from the claims of the Crown, but on the contrary, sometimes exerted his authority to impose what the king would not otherwise have ventured to demand.

A crisis in Church affairs.

The reaction produced by the operation of these causes decided that crisis in the affairs of our Church which arose in the thirteenth century, at the time when our political constitution was reaching the most momentous stage of its development, in a regular representation of the commons of the realm. When the old spirit of freedom and right, which had been suppressed but not extinguished by the despotic rule of the Conqueror and his immediate successors, had so far revived, and the consciousness of strength had been so far awakened in the commons, as finally to establish the principle—contained implicitly in the great Charter—that taxes should not be imposed without the consent of the subject, it became evident that the same maxim must be applied

to the clergy, and that it was no longer possible to resort to the expedients which had been previously adopted to extort subsidies from them by a violent strain of royal, papal, or episcopal authority. Traces are found of partial attempts to organize a representation of the inferior secular clergy adapted to this object before the reign of Edward I.; and there seems to be no reason to doubt that they were devised entirely for this purpose, the only one for which such an innovation could be required. It has indeed been contended that it ought to be considered simply as a natural development of the ancient state of things;* as merely a new arrangement by which the clergy of the second order now thought fit to regulate their exercise of the right which it is supposed they had always enjoyed, of attending and taking part in the provincial councils. But no occasion connected with their spiritual functions has been pointed out to account for the introduction of such a change at this time. The supposition of that ancient right on which the explanation rests is, as we have seen, more than questionable; and therefore the whole hypothesis may be dismissed as an arbitrary and improbable surmise.

Edward I. demands a subsidy from the clergy.

It appears that, so early as the third year of his reign, Edward I. having demanded a subsidy for the supply of his exigencies from the prelates assembled in Parliament, was met by the plea that they could not comply with his requisition until they had consulted the inferior clergy. Seven years later, in 1282, he tried the experiment of commanding the archbishop to summon the higher dignitaries of the province of Canterbury, together with the proxies of the deans and chapters, to his Parliament held at Northampton. The command was very reluctantly obeyed,† and the end for which the assembly was summoned was again for the time defeated, on the plea that a fuller attendance of the clergy was necessary to enable them to answer the king's demands. It was, however, agreed that the whole body of the clergy should be convened, in person or by their proxies, for this purpose, and

* Trevor, p. 32.

† "Dolentes, et inviti," in Wake, "State," &c., Appendix, Num. xxvi.

particularly that each of the bishops should in the meanwhile lay the matter before the clergy of his diocese, and should cause them to elect two proctors to appear in their behalf. In pursuance of this agreement the archbishop issued his mandate for summoning an assembly constituted in the form thus prescribed, and it met accordingly at the appointed day and place (the Temple in London) early in the following year, 1283. And this is commonly considered as the first session of Convocation, being that in which it first appears in the form which it preserved, with some variations,—chiefly regarding the religious orders, and not material to our present question,—in all succeeding ages. The only business transacted in it seems to have been the granting of the subsidy which was the occasion that called it into being.

First Session of Convocation.

We see at once that such an assembly might be viewed in a twofold aspect; and I think there can be little doubt that it was so viewed at the time by the parties concerned. On the one hand, the authority by which it was convened, the persons of which it was composed, the very place at which it met, mark it as nothing more than a provincial council, only distinguished from those of earlier times by the more fully-organized representation of the second order of the clergy. This was most probably the light in which it was regarded by all its members, being the most agreeable to their feelings of jealous concern for the dignity and independence of their order. The terms of the archbishop's mandate are framed as much as possible in accordance with this view of the subject; for the higher dignitaries are directed to be summoned "to treat of the matters which had been laid before them in their last congregation on the part of the king," and "further to do what the Lord shall inspire;"* and the representatives of the diocesan clergy were to be empowered to treat and consent to the provisions which should be made by the whole body "for the honour of the Church, the consolation of the king, and the peace of the realm."† But on the other hand, it was evident on the

Its twofold aspect.

* "Ulterius facturi quod Dominus inspirabit." Wake, Appendix, Num. xxviii.
† Ibid.

face of the same document, and still more clearly from the notorious facts of the case, that the assembly had been brought together in obedience to the royal will, and for the single purpose of consulting on the grant of a subsidy for the king's wars. And such, no doubt, was the construction which the king himself put on the proceedings which followed the Parliament at Northampton. He must have looked upon the step taken by the archbishop as nothing but a tardy and indirect compliance with his commands. To his eye the Convocation assembled under such circumstances would present no more of a spiritual character than if it had come together at the time and place which he had designed. In substance, though not in form, it was a parliamentary council, not a provincial synod.

Further exercise of the royal prerogative.

But though he had gained his immediate object in the supplies which he obtained, he was not content with such a circuitous mode of reaching his end, but was bent on bringing the whole body of the clergy, as now represented in the new Convocation, into Parliament. For this purpose a clause,—called from its first word the *Præmunientes*,—was inserted in the writ by which the bishops were summoned to Parliament, enjoining each of them to bring his archdeacon and the two proctors of his diocese to the meeting. The king's intention was to constitute the clergy a third house of Parliament. He probably hoped in this way to make them more subservient to his pleasure; but though at first they were compelled to obey his injunctions, and to meet the laity in Parliament, they considered this exercise of the royal prerogative as an infringement of their rights, as well as injurious to their interests. They would fain have established the principle that their property was entitled to exemption from all taxation for secular purposes. They also disputed the authority of the Crown to require their attendance, especially in an assembly of laymen. The obnoxious clause became the occasion of a struggle, which was carried on between them and the Crown during several successive reigns, and was at last terminated by a very singular and equivocal compromise. The injunction of personal attendance on the king ceased to be literally enforced; the proctors of the

clergy were allowed to absent themselves from Parliament. But the clause was retained as an invariable part of the writ of summons, while the end for which it was framed was accomplished by a different process. The king, at the same time, sent out another writ to each of the primates, directing him—in language between command and request*—to summon the clergy of his province to appear, not before the king in Parliament, but before the archbishop, in the northern province at York, in the southern at St. Paul's, London. The interests of the Crown were thus reconciled with the privileges of the clergy. The præmunitory clause, though seemingly become a dead letter, was really carried into effect in its spirit. The clergy, having been canonically convened by their chief pastor, though in obedience to a royal mandate, did not refuse to grant the subsidies needed by the king; and when they had dispatched this, the sole business for which they were called together, there was nothing to prevent them from passing to the consideration of other matters more properly belonging to an ecclesiastical council; though it seems to have been very long before they availed themselves of this opportunity, and that for near two hundred years they confined themselves in these assemblies to secular affairs.†

It has been usual to speak of this transaction as a prudent concession on the part of the Crown, who abandoned the shadow to make the more sure of the substance, but as a mistake in the clergy, who, through their obstinate adherence to extravagant pretensions, and their blind jealousy of the civil power, cast away the invaluable privilege of a direct share in the functions of the lower branch of the legislature. But it seems very doubtful whether they lost any thing which they would have been long able to keep.‡ Their jealousy of the royal prerogative was not stronger than that with which their own claims were regarded by the laity. In one or two instances, indeed, statutes appear to have been enacted on the petition of the clergy

Which was perhaps the best for the clergy.

* *Rogando mandamus.*

† Kennett, p. 57.

‡ See the remarks of Mr. Hallam, "Middle Ages," vol. ii. p. 265.

without the consent of the Commons. But this proceeding drew forth remonstrances which could not be safely neglected. And it is highly improbable that the proctors of the clergy would long have been allowed to stand on such a footing of equality with the representatives of the people, or to take any part in deliberations affecting the civil rights and temporal interests of the community. The course into which they were led in this instance by their instinctive tenacity of the privileges of their order, was perhaps that which would have been dictated by an enlightened view of their real position.

Original character of Convocation.

But to return to our subject. It is manifest how greatly the peculiar circumstances attending the origin of Convocation increase the difficulty of forming an exact notion of its character and lend a specious colour to various conflicting opinions. Some will see in it nothing but an occasional assembly of the clergy, convened in an unusual form, for the purpose of self-taxation, equally distinct from the Parliament on the one hand, and from an ordinary provincial synod on the other.* Others contend that, notwithstanding some outward points of difference, it was essentially a Parliamentary assembly, regularly attendant on the Parliament, with similar and equal constitutional rights.† Others, again, maintain that it was simply a provincial council, called indeed upon a state occasion, but by the proper ecclesiastical authority, composed in a manner substantially, though not in all its minute particulars, conformable to the practice of earlier ages, and consequently competent to the exercise of every spiritual function incident to such a synod.‡ All these discordant views have been advocated with much learning and acuteness, and we may therefore readily believe that each contains some measure of truth, which, if we could disentangle it from the arguments urged in support of them, might enable us, if not to bring them into harmony with one another, at least to keep clear of their opposite errors. Thus it cannot fairly be denied that the Convocation of 1283 was indeed an occasional extraordinary assembly, constituted and held for the single purpose of delibe-

* Wake. † Atterbury, p. 64. ‡ Trevor, u. s. p. 54.

rating on the grant of a subsidy to the Crown. But this fact does not warrant the conclusion that the assemblies afterwards convened by the Convocation-writ were wholly unconnected with the Parliament, which met at the same time. Even while the præmunitory clause continued to be at least partially carried into effect to the letter, the Convocation-writ may most properly be considered as ancillary and supplementary to it, being expressly designed for the accomplishment of the very same object. They were both corresponding parts of a complicated machinery, which was found necessary to effect a compromise between the prerogative of the Crown and the privileges of the clergy. Then, again, though we must reject the opinion that Convocation was merely a development or a fixing of the ancient form of the provincial synod; it must be admitted that, when the new form had been established for the assemblies of the clergy which met concurrently with the Parliament, it became the invariable constitution of the English provincial councils, even when they were assembled at other times, and for the transaction of truly spiritual matters: and the term Convocation was extended from its original meaning, of a body convened in obedience to a royal mandate for the dispatch of civil business, to an ordinary synod, meeting to consult on the affairs of the Church. But still the accidental identity of the name cannot efface, and should not be allowed to conceal the broad distinction between things so different in their nature; and mischievous confusion must ensue when the same reasoning is applied indiscriminately to both. The Parliamentary Convocation might, so long as the clergy retained the right of separate self-taxation, be justly regarded as an essential part of our constitution.* But that a synod composed in the same manner, should be assembled for spiritual objects as often as a new Parliament meets, cannot surely be claimed as a right, on any ground, either of constitutional principle, or of ancient ecclesiastical practice.

Down to the reign of Henry VIII., as the sovereign had

* An "ecclesiastical assembly, collateral in a certain sense to Parliament, yet very intimately connected with it, whether sitting by virtue of the Præmunientes clause or otherwise," it is called by Mr. Hallam, "Middle Ages," vol. ii. p. 266. 8th edit.

directed the summoning of Convocation as often, and at whatever times the exigencies of the State appeared to require it, so the archbishop had been at liberty to exercise his own discretion in the calling of a synod. But in the 21st year of that reign, a petition was presented to the king by the House of Commons, in which they complained "that the clergy in their Convocation had been used to make laws concerning temporal things, enforced by spiritual censures, without the assent of king or Parliament, to the great trouble and inquietation of the king's lay subjects, and impeachment of the royal prerogative:" and after some ineffectual attempt to resist or elude the united will of the Commons and the Crown, the clergy found themselves forced to consent to that limitation of their legislative authority which was afterwards embodied in the Act of Submission, passed in the year 1534, and, after it had been repealed in the reign of Mary on the petition of the clergy, re-enacted, without any express renewal of their consent, in the first year of Elizabeth. This statute forms the most important epoch in the history of Convocation, and finally determined the extent of its legislative powers. It recites the previous submission of the clergy, and in accordance with it provides that Convocation should always be assembled by authority of the king's writ, and forbids it to make, promulge, or execute any canons, constitutions, and ordinances, without the royal assent and licence. It is remarkable that in the submission which was the groundwork of this Act, and which, however extorted from them through fear, appears to have been framed in terms of their own choice, the clergy acknowledge, as they say, "according to the truth," that their "Convocations are, always have been, and ought to be assembled by the king's writ." This admission has been thought to be at variance with the truth, because at the beginning of the same reign a council was held by Archbishop Warham, entirely, as far as appears, on his own authority, without any mandate from the king.* But however this may have

Power of the archbishop.

Provisions of the Act of Submission.

* Wake, however ("State," p. 27), gives some strong reasons for thinking that this also was a Convocation summoned by the king's writ.

been, it is clear that every assembly of the clergy which would otherwise be competent to make canons, must be held to be included within the scope of the Act. A graver doubt has been raised as to the extent of the prohibition which restricts the action of Convocation when assembled. There is some little obscurity in the wording of the statute on this point, and it has been contended that it was only designed to limit the power of making canons; but that for any proceedings short of that stage, though carried to the length of preparing the draft of a canon, no more express permission was required than is contained in the general licence granted by the writ of summons, to treat, consent, and conclude; though it is admitted that for the purpose of *concluding* the writ did not give sufficient authority. It seems that this question was not formally raised before the reign of James I., when it was decided by the judges, that even after Convocation had been assembled by the king's writ, it could not confer with a view to the making of canons without a distinct licence. On the other hand it seems clear that the prohibition relates only to canons, and leaves Convocation, when duly assembled, at liberty to enter upon any other kind of business, and to discuss every question affecting the interests of the Church, which may form the subject of a petition or address to the Throne.

Obscurity of the Statute.

This Act has often been represented as a violent strain of the royal prerogative, and the submission on which it was grounded as a concession wrung from the clergy by their dread of an arbitrary monarch, from whom they had recently experienced very rigorous treatment. But the abuses described in the petition of the House of Commons certainly called aloud for a remedy, and the power of the Crown to prohibit canons injurious to its prerogative or to the rights of the subject had proved insufficient to guard against the evil. If the clergy had really suffered any detriment from the measure, they had reason to attribute it to their own indiscreet exercise of their ancient privileges. But as far as concerned their independence, the whole principle of the Act was involved in that veto which the Crown already possessed.

All that was now done was to regulate and to render more effectual the control which it had always claimed over the proceedings of Convocation. It is true this additional power carried with it a grave responsibility. The magistrate in whom it was vested was bound to use it for the general good, and especially for the benefit of the Church, in the largest sense of the word. How this is to be done is a question on which he must exercise his own judgment. But he is under no engagement to lay it down as a governing principle of his conduct, that the prosperity of the Church is to be measured by the frequency and length of the sessions of the clergy.

Its principle.

It is admitted by those who are most dissatisfied with the Act of Submission that in fact ample facilities have since been afforded to Convocation for the most important work which a synod could undertake, that which has fixed the doctrine, ritual, and discipline of our Reformed Church on an immoveable basis, though in some comparatively trifling particulars liable to variation and capable of improvement. No business of equal or similar moment, it may be safely said, awaits any future Convocation. In the meanwhile the original character of the assembly underwent a material change in the reign of Charles II., when the clergy consented to relinquish the privilege of taxing themselves through representatives chosen out of their own order, and in return obtained that of voting for members of Parliament in right of their benefices. This was indeed a very wise measure, and highly advantageous to the clergy. It relieved them from the odium of an invidious distinction from which they reaped no solid benefit. Their influence was increased by their admission to the common elective franchise, while they retained their own peculiar representation for purposes connected with the interests of the Church. But it entirely removed the ground on which the right of the great body of the clergy to be represented in Convocation, and that of Convocation itself to be regularly assembled, originally stood. Each was left to depend, not upon any constitutional principle, but partly on length of usage, and partly on considerations of per-

Facilities afforded to Convocation.

manent or temporary expediency. The claim of the clerical constituency to the right of returning members to Convocation, though derived from a state of things which had ceased to exist, needed no support from prescription. It rested on the more solid basis of manifest fitness and utility. The only question about which there could be a reasonable doubt was, whether the ancient mode of representation did not need a reform to render it more adequate and complete. More than a hundred and fifty years ago the imperfection of the existing form was remarked by one who was not inclined to favour any extravagant pretensions of the Lower House. Bishop Kennett observes: "I aver it to be a clear and undoubted part of English history, that the lower clergy were not always sitting and acting in our solemn Church assemblies. Nor was it their right of ecclesiastical judicature, but their right of civil property, that first brought them into national Parliaments, then into Parliamentary provincial convocations, and by later degrees into proper ecclesiastical synods; where custom and continued practice have so long confirmed them, and where the interests of the Church do so much require them, that I would by all means have their concurrence to be now a sacred and inviolable right. My wishes and earnest desires would be, that the parochial clergy in England were more equally and fully represented in our Convocations; that their proctors in the Lower House might be at least a balance to the other dignified presbyters, and not be exceeded by them more than one half. Possibly," he adds, with reference to the contests of his day, "it will more become the wisdom and the conscience of Churchmen to solicit for some amendments and improvements in the constitution of our English Synods, than to call fiercely for such alone as are not altogether so full, nor altogether so effectual."

Right of clergy to return members.

Rights of the Lower House.

But with regard to the Convocation itself the case is very different. "Custom and continued practice" are the only reasons that can now be assigned for the regularity with which it is summoned to attend every meeting of Parliament. "The interests

of the Church" cannot "require" that it should be held more frequently than those provincial synods which were assembled as occasion arose to call for their agency. However justly its constant concurrence with the session of Parliament may be regarded, on the ground of custom, as a sacred and inviolable right, this right is satisfied as soon as it is convened. Its continued sitting for the despatch of business cannot, I conceive, be properly considered as matter of right, binding upon those who have the power of proroguing or dissolving it, but only as a subject on which they are at liberty to exercise their discretion according to the view they take of that which the interests of the Church at any time actually require. Every argument that can now be urged for synodal action in Convocation must resolve itself into a plea of expediency.

Why Convocation and Parliament meet simultaneously.

However some of us may deplore the long suspension of synodical deliberations, it seems to be only from a want of due reflection on the circumstances of the case that any one can treat it as an oppressive coercion imposed on the Church by the State, through an abuse of the power with which it had been entrusted for the Church's benefit. It is fit, indeed, that we should make the largest possible allowance for the effect of the political excitement which prevailed for a long period after the Revolution of 1688, and from which it was neither to be expected, nor perhaps to be desired, that the clergy should have been exempt. But we ought not to shut our eyes to the fact, that this excitement had transformed Convocation into a field of party conflict, carried on in a spirit which rendered its proceedings worse than useless, and which, while it gave umbrage to the Government, not yet securely established under the new settlement, probably created general disgust throughout the country. Sober-minded Churchmen might lament the effect no less than the cause; but they could not deny that the blame rested mainly with those who were the loudest asserters of the rights, powers, and privileges of Convocation, but who contributed most, by their acts and writings, to bring it into suspicion and discredit. So late as the year 1742 an opportunity of discussion was afforded,

Suspension of its deliberations.

sufficient to try the temper with which it would have been likely to enter upon the consideration of any matters on which it might have received licence to treat: and the result proved that nothing could be expected but a renewal of the old unseemly and frivolous contests. The silence imposed on such disputes could inspire no regret. It was evidently better that the proctors of the clergy should be engaged in their parochial work than in these scenes of fruitless and heating controversy. It has indeed been asserted* that to the continued intermission of synodical action we have to attribute the lethargy which, during the greater part of the last century, overpowered the Church, stifling all healthy movement, and only broken by starts of a convulsive energy which, in the end, rent her own body. But this opinion appears to confound cause and effect, and is not only utterly unsupported by facts, but in direct and palpable contradiction to the clearest evidence of history, and to our own freshest recollection of the past. The inaction of Convocation has plainly no more to do with the deadness which prevailed in the Church in the last century than with the revival which has so signally marked the present. We are bound to acknowledge with thankfulness that the want of this agency has not prevented her from exhibiting signs of vigour, and exerting a measure of influence far exceeding any that she showed when she had all the resources of Convocation at her disposal. And therefore we have ground to trust, that if that privilege should still for a season be withheld from her, she would yet be able to prosecute her work through her ordinary instruments with growing activity and success. And it is right that we should keep in mind how very far the blessings which we already enjoy outweigh any which depend on the recovery of that privilege. The very eagerness which has been displayed for the attainment of this object shows that the business

* Trevor, "The Two Convocations," p. 75. The author of the "Letter to a Convocation Man," attributed with great probability to Sir Bartholomew Shower, seems to have persuaded himself that there was "need of a Convocation," and, therefore, that it was within its power, "to give a check to the farther proceeding of the loose and pernicious opinions,"—"scepticism, Deism, and Atheism itself;" which, he says, "have overrun us like a deluge."

of a revived Convocation would be not to infuse a new spirit into the Church—which indeed all experience proves to be utterly beyond the power of a synod to effect—but to regulate that which has been already awakened, and to prepare channels into which it may be usefully directed. It is a mischievous exaggeration to treat this as a question of supreme or vital moment to the being or the well-being of the Church. At the highest it can only be considered as relating to one among a variety of means toward the common end; one neither of indispensable necessity, nor comparable in importance to some which we have at our undisputed command.

Duties of a revived Convocation.

But though we may believe that the claims of Convocation have sometimes been urged on untenable grounds, and that its efficacy has been greatly exaggerated, we should be running into an opposite extreme far less excusable if we should refuse to entertain the question whether it may not be safely employed for several useful purposes, which could not be accomplished without its aid; or if we should slight any of the advantages which may be fairly expected from it, because they are not of the highest order. The state of the Church is certainly not such that she can afford to dispense with any means of strengthening her position and enlarging her influence. There are no doubt many favoured situations where the clergyman, unhindered and not overtasked in his allotted sphere of labour, feels no want of any assistance for the carrying on of his parochial work, and would probably remain wholly unaffected by any results of renewed synodical action. But if we look beyond these local limits to the general condition of the Church in her relation to the great mass of our population, and to the bodies separated from her communion, we see exigencies which are manifestly beyond the reach of any efforts that can be made by individuals acting apart from one another, and are only to be met, if at all, by the united counsel and co-operation of the whole body. Under such circumstances it is at least natural that many eyes should be turned toward that which is, in the canonical sense, the Church of England by representation, for help or guidance; and every friend of the

Advantages to be derived from it.

Church must desire that it should be ascertained by a fair trial how far such expectations may be realized, though he might not think the prospect sufficiently clear to warrant an experiment attended with any serious risk.

The proceedings of Convocation in its last two sessions have probably contributed more to allay jealousy and prejudice, and to promote a right understanding of the subject, in its practical bearings, than all the discussion it had previously undergone. This is one of the cases in which the first step is both the most difficult and the most important, as indicating the course of the future progress. From that which has been done, attempted, or proposed, something may be reasonably inferred as to the work which Convocation may be expected to undertake, and as to the probable range of its operations. The announcement of the fact, that after so long an interval of inaction its meetings had once again become something more than an empty form, was hailed with exultation by those who had been anxious for the resumption of its functions, while by others it was received with vehement displeasure and gloomy forebodings. The character of its proceedings have been such as, if not to justify that exultation, in a great measure to disarm the hostility of its opponents. The time during which it was permitted to continue its conferences has confessedly not been wasted or misemployed, and, short as it was, has been found sufficient for the transaction of the most important business that could occupy its attention at that stage of its proceedings—the appointment of committees of both Houses to consider and report on some of the questions which seemed to call most urgently for an early decision.

Character of its proceedings.

In the session before last such a committee was appointed to consider of an address to the Crown, with a view to a measure for the better enforcing of discipline among the clergy. The pressing need of such a measure is universally acknowledged; and in the course of the last session of Parliament was repeatedly brought under public notice by some of the highest legal authorities in the House of Lords. But, as was observed on one of those occasions, the question is one on which there can be

Report on discipline.

no hope of a satisfactory settlement, unless an opportunity be afforded to the clergy of conferring upon it through their authorized representatives. The Report presented to Convocation last year by the committee charged with this inquiry contained the heads of a measure for this purpose which were the result of very careful consideration; and it likewise offered a suggestion on the difficult and important question of the composition of a court of final appeal in cases of heresy.

Committee on the constitution of Convocation.

During the last session two joint committees were long occupied with subjects of still larger range. One of these related to the constitution of Convocation; and the inquiry embraced not only the reforms which might be required to enable it to exercise its functions with the fuller confidence of the Church, but also the ground of those disputes which were formerly agitated with so much violence and acrimony between the two Houses, as to their respective rights and privileges. The second was directed to the examination of no less a subject than the means by which the Church may be enabled to provide for the spiritual necessities of the growing masses of our population. The discussion of these questions in committees so constituted, and composed of persons widely differing from one another in many of their views, but all earnestly desirous of promoting the common object, was itself a clear and not a trifling gain. The spirit in which it was conducted was more than a happy presage,—it was an earnest of the good temper, forbearance, and mutual respect with which it may be hoped these and like matters will continue to be treated in the regular assemblies of the clergy. The reports of the committees on both questions have been presented to Convocation, and submitted to public scrutiny, and a ground has thus been laid for farther proceedings, with a view to carrying their suggestions into effect.

And on spiritual necessities of the people.

With regard to the constitution of Convocation, the only changes suggested by the committee are those which are required to give that fuller representation to the parochial clergy which Bishop Kennett thought so desirable, that their proctors might

at least balance the dignified presbyters by whom they have hitherto been so greatly outnumbered. It seems evident that until this disproportion be corrected the resolutions of the Lower House can never be considered as an authentic exponent of the opinions and feelings of the great body of the clergy; and we may therefore trust that this proposal will meet with general approbation. Two other points on which opinions might be expected to be much more divided the committee thought it best to reserve untouched for the judgment of Convocation, when in some such way newly organized. One of these was the best mode of combining the Convocations of the two provinces for the purpose of united deliberations. And as to this it can hardly be denied, that whatever purpose is to be answered by either of these assemblies when separately convened will be much more effectually attained when they are combined in a national synod; and that a decision which was the result of their joint consultations would carry far greater weight with it than if it should have originated in one alone, and have been afterwards adopted by the other. The subject is one of considerable difficulty, not so much because there is reason to apprehend any serious opposition to the principle of the measure, as because it will require great care and caution in the adjustment of its practical details. The other point on which the committee, while acknowledging its high importance, forbore to enter, is the admission of representatives of the lay members of the Church to a place in Convocation. Undoubtedly this is the most momentous, as well as the most complicated and difficult of all the questions bearing upon this subject. Without some representation of the laity it seems impossible that Convocation can realize the description of the 139th Canon, except so far as the Church is identified with the clergy. And I will add that, so long as it continues to be a purely clerical assembly, it will be only in a very scanty measure that it can be expected to possess the sympathy and confidence of the lay members of the Church. But though for this reason I regard such an expansion of its constitution as much to be desired, I must own that the obstacles, both internal and external,

Changes suggested in the constitution.

which stand in the way of this development appear to me at present almost insurmountable; and until a great change shall have taken place in our prospects, I should deprecate any attempt even to stir the question as premature and injudicious. In the meanwhile much will have been gained if Convocation shall be effectually adapted to the purpose of ascertaining the mind of the clergy on matters concerning the interests of the Church. This indeed will be most important when the questions referred to their judgment chiefly affect the duties, rights, and privileges of their order, though no such questions can ever be really foreign to any member of the Church. But on the other hand, since they as a body are most deeply interested in all subjects connected with the welfare of the Church, there can be none such on which it must not be very important to obtain an authentic expression of their sentiments, while there is certainly no reason to fear lest it should exert more than its due share of influence on the minds of the laity.

The most satisfactory solution of all the questions which have arisen with regard to the constitution of Convocation would of course be only preparatory to the exercise of its deliberative functions. The report of the committee appointed to inquire into the means by which the Church might be enabled to make better provision for the spiritual wants of great masses of our people, who are at present beyond the reach of her ordinary ministrations, seems to mark the limits within which the labours of Convocation could be usefully employed upon the largest and gravest of all subjects that can engage its attention, that to which all others must be regarded as subordinate. It suggests the expediency of a freer use of the Book of Common Prayer, for the purpose of adapting the services of the Church to the varied exigencies of populous districts, where her work partakes more of the missionary character than that for which her Liturgy was originally framed. It is conceived that this object may be attained without the slightest alteration of the services now used on ordinary occasions, partly by the authorizing of such a division

Report of committee on spiritual requirements.

of the Morning Service for Sundays and holidays as would make it available for different congregations without repetition, partly by an abridgment of the Order of Daily Prayer for other times, and partly by compilations and selections from the materials furnished by the Prayer Book, for short services suited to special occasions. It is, I think, beyond a doubt that these arrangements would be found very beneficial, as affording some new facilities for the extension of pastoral superintendence, without the need of any great addition either to the numbers or the labours of the clergy. But no one supposes that these or the other liturgical changes recommended in the report would of themselves very materially strengthen the Church in the performance of her home missionary work. The more important branch of the inquiry was that which related to the agency by which this work is to be carried on. The report directs the attention of Convocation to the various quarters in which we may look for the supply of our need. It points to the co-operation of the lay members of the Church as capable, if properly organized in due subordination to the parochial clergy, of affording them most valuable help, by opening the way for their ministrations among the poor and ignorant, and by taking a share in those of their labours which are not of a strictly spiritual nature, though subservient to pious and charitable ends. For the more direct attainment of the object, it suggests the expediency of opening a door into the lowest order of the ministry to candidates whose literary proficiency falls short of the ordinary standard at present required for the office of deacon, but who should not be admissible to the priesthood before the end of five years, and then only after having undergone the usual examination. To this it is proposed to add the institution of bodies of ministers specially dedicated to the home missionary work, either fixed in the centres of populous districts, or, under the direction of the bishop, extending their services as occasions arose for them through the whole of the diocese. And finally, an enlargement of the episcopate, in accordance with the design of our Reformers to erect additional sees, and in some measure corresponding to the

subsequent growth of our population, especially in its great centres, is recommended as a subject deserving attentive consideration,

It is remarkable, and may be regarded as a cheering augury of future unanimity, that the committee of *gravamina* of the Lower House, having had their attention especially directed to the general question which the last of these joint committees was appointed to consider, arrived independently at very similar conclusions on many of the points included in the report of the joint committee; and as to none of them does there seem to be reason for apprehending any wide divergency of views between the two Houses.

Similar conclusions arrived at by Lower House.

Now as to some of the suggestions contained in these reports, it is evident that no other authority is needed for carrying them into effect than that which each bishop already possesses in his own diocese; and that in every such case the sanction of Convocation could only serve to remove scruples which might otherwise be felt as to the exercise of such authority, and to call it into action more frequently and uniformly, as a part of the ordinary system of the Church. Others of these proposals are precarious, and could only be carried out by the interposition of the Crown or the legislature. So far, therefore, the result must depend on the state of parties, and the temper of Parliament. But when the hereditary jealousy and aversion with which Convocation has been so long viewed by the State have so far abated as to permit the renewal of its deliberations, though it may be under close restrictions, it seems hardly possible that the expression of its judgment on matters within its province should not carry an overpowering weight in a body composed chiefly of professed members of our Church, or that measures which it recommends, if reasonable in themselves, should fail in the end to obtain the concurrence of the civil power. And at present all appearances indicate that there will be no attempt or disposition in any quarter to limit that measure of liberty which Convocation has now enjoyed for two sessions, and which has enabled it through its committees to discuss

Observations on the reports.

Present state and prospects of Convocation.

so many important questions, and to prepare so much weighty business for its future meetings. On the contrary, there is the fairest prospect that, so long as it continues to manifest the same degree of prudence and moderation which has marked its recent proceedings, as it will undoubtedly gain ground in public confidence and esteem, it will be allowed to enlarge the sphere of its action, and to take cognizance of a greater number of subjects affecting the well-being of the Church. It would not, for instance, be extravagant to hope that, when a general conviction has prevailed, that it has no desire to abuse its privileges, it will be admitted that the time has arrived when it may be profitably employed in the revising of the canons and the rubric, for the purpose of clearing away the fictions and anomalies by which they are now disfigured, and which are at once a reproach to the Church and a stumbling-block to tender consciences, and to bring them into harmony with the real state of things, and the actual wants of our age. It must, I think, before long, become clear even to the most timorous minds, when they consider the checks which guard every stage of synodal action from beginning to end, that however capable Convocation may be of damaging itself in public opinion, by any ambitious attempt or unscrupulous overstepping of its prescribed and stipulated bounds, there is no danger of any other kind of evil resulting from such imprudence. Not only has it no independent legislative authority, by which it could encroach upon existing rights, or introduce perilous innovations, but it is liable at any moment to be reduced to silence and inaction.

Imperfection of suggested expedients.

But whatever ground there may be for such anticipations, we should plainly be deceiving ourselves if we supposed that any of the expedients suggested by the committees of Convocation could go far toward the attainment of the main object, the bringing of the multitudes who are now beyond the reach of the Church's ministrations within the range of her influence. After the largest allowances for the effect which may be produced by a more active co-operation on the part of the laity, and by the institution of home missions, it seems clear that no great and permanent results can be looked for without a

larger supply of clerical labourers, and none of the schemes which have been proposed to provide for this want, as by some new modification of the diaconate, has pointed out how the necessary means are to be obtained.* Nor has any one attempted to show that it would be in the power of Convocation to open any fresh resources, or to infuse new vigour into the societies which have hitherto been engaged in this work, still less advantageously to supersede them. There is nothing in its past history to warrant the belief that it can exert any other than a regulative, controlling, and restrictive agency, or to lead us to look to such a body for an impulse which might rouse the Church to extraordinary undertakings. On the other hand, it would be rash to attempt to define the amount of good which it might effect under new and strongly stimulating circumstances by calculations grounded on the experience of ordinary times. And, happily, it is quite needless for any practical purpose so to reach forward into the future. If we are only convinced that there is a work, however limited in extent, required for the interests of the Church, which Convocation is alone or best qualified to perform, and which it may be safely allowed to undertake, we are clearly bound to use our best endeavours to remove every obstruction which would impede its legitimate and salutary action. If there are any who would wish to see it entering upon a different course, one which would tend to agitate the Church with fresh controversies, or to excite jealousy and alarm among the laity, though they would assuredly be disappointed in their ultimate object, as the first step in such a course would probably be the last, still, so far as they might succeed at the outset, on them would rest the responsibility of having blighted all the hopes which are now cherished by many zealous yet discreet friends of the Church, of solid advantages to be reaped frem the renewal of synodical action in the only form now known to our ecclesiastical constitution.

Capacities of Convocation for good.

* The suggestion offered in "Thoughts on an Extension of the Diaconate and on Lay Agency," by the Rev. E. Harold Browne,—a combination of the Diaconate with secular callings, can only be regarded as an experiment, and it is one which appears to me both questionable in its character and extremely doubtful as to its result.

It may seem that I have need to apologize, not, perhaps, for having taken up too much of your time with a single topic—which its importance may well be allowed to justify—but for the length at which I have dwelt on some points which may be thought to possess no other than a historical or antiquarian interest. I can however say, not only that they appear to myself to be very material for a correct view of the question, but that the consideration of them has been in a manner forced upon me, by what I regard as erroneous conclusions of no slight practical moment, which have been drawn from a different representation of the same facts. I will now dismiss the subject with a word or two regarding the future.

Whatever hopes some of us may indulge as to the future proceedings of Convocation, we ought not to shut our eyes to the fact that the prospect which seems to be now dawning upon us may be again overcast through some unforeseen turn of events, by which either a stop may be put to the action of Convocation, or its working may be strictly limited to the exertion of a purely moral influence, without any aid from the Crown or the Legislature. It may therefore be well to keep in mind that in the latter of these two cases we should be in no worse position than a Church which is not adopted by the State. And in the former the Church would still possess the means of bringing not merely an equal, but a far greater amount of moral influence to bear upon any object which was within the reach of her spiritual authority. At present all the moral weight of Convocation, as an exponent of the mind of the clergy, rests upon the concert of two perfectly independent assemblies, the one sitting in London, the other at York. In the event I am supposing, the result would depend upon the unanimity of a far greater number of diocesan synods, the convoking of which is always in the power of the episcopate. And manifold as are the advantages of a representative assembly, the less convenient mode of gathering the suffrages of the clergy would at least have that of furnishing more decisive evidence of their real sentiments.

Church prospects.

And this suggests another remark of more immediate practical application. It seems clear that comparatively little benefit can be expected from the renewed activity of Convocation without a general co-operation among the clergy in the several dioceses, and that this can only be obtained through meetings for united deliberation. In my first Charge I pointed out some of the advantages which might be looked for from periodical conferences of the clergy, and expressed my opinion, that no equal amount of good was likely to be produced by the public gatherings, hitherto exclusively known among us under the name of Clerical Meetings, while they were attended with danger of serious evils. If my suggestion was not carried into effect, I have no reason to believe that it was because it did not meet with the assent of the clergy, but only that some practical difficulties appeared to stand in the way. But very recently I have had the pleasure of hearing that a movement towards the same object which I then recommended has arisen spontaneously in one archdeaconry; and I am the more inclined to hope, on account of its spontaneous origin, that it may prove the beginning of a more widely extended action in the same direction. I trust that those who have set it on foot will not let themselves be discouraged from persevering in it, though it should not seem at first to yield all the fruit which they may have anticipated from it. I would have them remember that the capacities of such an institution are not to be measured by its temporary efficiency. I hope that the example will, before long, be followed by every archdeaconry in the diocese. I should wish that these associations may become not merely centres of local union, each in its own sphere, but also bonds of unity pervading the whole diocese; and this might easily be effected, if the practical results of their several conferences were communicated to me in reports, which might be read at our annual meetings of the rural deans. Each would thus become common property, and an opportunity would be afforded for weighing and comparing them, with a view to turn every useful suggestion to the best account. It is at least satisfactory to know that we have all the machinery requisite for

Co-operation of clergymen necessary.

so desirable an object ready to our hands, and that it rests entirely with ourselves whether we will avail ourselves of it or not.

There are only a few other points, partly of general, partly of local interest, on which I shall need to occupy a little more of your time.

Church-rates.

At the beginning of the last session of Parliament strong hopes and wishes were, I believe, very generally entertained that before its close some measure might be passed, by which the vexed question of church-rates might be brought to a final and satisfactory adjustment. But though I shared both the expectation and the desire, I must own that, considering the character of the measures which were brought forward for the purpose, I am now rather disposed to rejoice that no decisive step has been taken, and that further time has been allowed for more mature consideration of the subject. A joint committee of the two Houses of Convocation has been appointed to confer upon it, and I trust that their inquiries and deliberations may lead to a clearer understanding of the present position of the Church in this respect, and of the course which it behoves her to pursue. At present we do not possess sufficient means of judging how far the interests of the Church, with regard to the sustentation of her sacred edifices, have been or are likely to be affected by the operation of the final decision in the Braintree case; for the practical working of that decision is certainly not to be measured by the change which it may have introduced in the legal theory which previously prevailed on the subject. The same authority which decided that case affirmed the general principle, that the parishioners of every parish are under an imperative legal obligation to provide for the necessary repairs of the church, and for the expenses incidental to public worship. It has been speciously argued that this principle is inconsistent with the judgment given in the last resort; inasmuch as the supposed obligation could only be enforced by the levying of a rate, which, as is now determined by the final judgment, is only valid when made by a real, and not merely a constructive majority in vestry, and consequently that no such

The Braintree case.

obligation can ever have existed otherwise than as contingent on the will of the majority; in other words, that the parishioners have always been at full liberty to exercise their own discretion on the subject, except that the minority have ever been legally bound by the act of the majority.* The real state of the case I apprehend to be this. So long as the National Church was really co-extensive with the nation—Church and nation, only names of the same society under two different aspects—the duty of the parishioners to repair the parish church, and provide for the decent celebration of public worship, could not be brought into dispute. Their discretion was undoubtedly confined to the subordinate question touching the ways and means of fulfilling the admitted duty. If it was ever neglected, the terror of spiritual censures, sanctioned by the law of the land, and therefore a part of that law, would have been sufficient to enforce it. There was no motive or occasion for the interference either of the temporal courts or of the Legislature. The universal acknowledgment of the principle rendered it needless to provide any new sanction for it. After the circumstances of the case had been materially changed by the progress of religious dissent, the law remained unaltered, and assumed the continuance of the ancient state of things. The action of the spiritual courts had lost a great part of its efficacy, though not through any cause recognized by the law as abridging their authority, and yet no provision was made for the supply of this deficiency. And we have now lived to see this fact used as an argument to prove, that the principle in question was never known to the law, and that it always rested with the free choice of the parishioners whether they would repair their parish church, or suffer it to go to ruin. The anomaly which was disclosed or created by the result of the Braintree case, of an acknowledged right without an effectual remedy,† and which is

* "An Examination of the Law of Church-rates, showing that the Parish is under no legal obligation to repair the Church." By Watkin Williams, of the Inner Temple.

† On the remedy still remaining against a recusant majority, which, whether practically effectual or not, is a clear proof of the legal obligation, see "A Brief Statement of the Effect of the Judgments given in the Braintree Case on the Law of Church-rates," by the Rev. George Martin, M.A., Chancellor of the Diocese of Exeter.

left to subsist only by virtue of a political necessity, has been urged as a ground for denying the reality of the right.

But as the learned persons who decided that case did not conceive that the general principle of the parochial liability was at all shaken by their judgment, so it appears that down to that time the point was one on which the opinions of all parties, however divided in their feelings on the subject, were perfectly agreed. The opponents of church-rates resisted them on grounds which were equally applicable to the cases in which the rate was made by the majority and by the minority of the ratepayers. They had no doubt about the law, but they complained of the law as unjust. This appears very clearly from the language in which the majority of the Braintree vestry recorded their motives for refusing the rate. It was because they conceived "compulsory church-rates, and more especially such rates upon Dissenters, to be as a tax unjust, and as an ecclesiastical imposition adverse to religious liberty, and contrary to the spirit of Christianity," that they "felt themselves bound," as they declared, "by the highest obligations of social justice and of religious principle, to refuse the rate." They were manifestly quite unconscious that they were simply exercising the discretionary power given to them by the law. They evidently shared the universal belief that the object for which the rate was proposed was a charge legally incident to their property, one therefore by which the value of that property was modified when it passed into their hands: but, considering it in the light of a burden, not on their property but on their consciences, cast on them by an oppressive law, they felt themselves bound, if possible, to shake it off. The decision by which their property has been practically relieved from this charge has, to that extent, really increased its value. This however is a benefit which, though not purchased by any equivalent, has accrued to them fairly, through an authentic interpretation of the law: and though, if the Legislature in former times had made more effectual provision for the enforcement of the general obligation, they would have had no just claim to exemption, it is now too late to

Motives for resisting church-rates.

supply that omission. The creation of a new remedy could hardly be distinguished from the imposition of a new burden.

Objections considered.

But the objection to *compulsory* church-rates would apply just as forcibly to the indisputably legal right of the majority to bind the minority, and is based upon a principle which, if consistently carried out, would lead to the dissolution of all civil society. For a compulsory *church-rate* is neither more nor less unjust than any other impost levied for purposes of which the person subject to it conscientiously disapproves. But there is manifestly no assignable limit to the scruples of conscience, which may be felt with regard to the purposes to which any part of the public funds may be applied. No branch of the public expenditure is more strongly opposed by some, on purely religious grounds, than that of the military establishments on which the national independence and safety most immediately depend. The objection therefore to church-rates as compulsory really implies that no charge can be rightfully laid upon property without the personal consent of each individual concerned; and that when imposed it should continue subject to the like consent in the case of all those into whose hands the same property may successively pass. It is easy to see that such a doctrine virtually strikes at the root of all government and social order.

Mode of levying the rates objectionable.

But though the plea of conscience and religious liberty appears to me altogether foreign to this question, and though I should think that to surrender the existing powers of levying church-rates, except in consideration of some equivalent advantage to the Church, would be an act, not of justice but of mere improvident waste, I am nevertheless deeply convinced that the present mode of providing for the object is very unsatisfactory, and that the gain which the Church might derive both in a material and a spiritual point of view from a different arrangement would be worth a considerable sacrifice. Among the evils of the present system are to be reckoned, not merely its invidiousness, which is not the less an evil because it rests, as I believe, on ignorance and misapprehension, nor the occasion which it ministers of constantly renewed strife and bitter-

ness, but also its necessary wastefulness, wherever the making of a rate is attended with much difficulty. I am persuaded that a large part of the expense which has been incurred for the repair of churches in this diocese would have been spared, to say nothing of the comfort of the congregation or the decency of public worship, if there had been a fund always available for the purpose as the need arose. However the problem may be solved, I trust that the provision of a sufficient number of free sittings for the poor will never cease to be regarded as one of its indispensable conditions.

Since our last meeting the work of church building and restoration has been proceeding in the diocese, with certainly no abatement of the activity of former years. If that of providing the means of education for the poor has advanced with regard to the building of schools somewhat less rapidly, it is because, as it spreads into the poorer rural districts, its progress is retarded by increasing difficulties. Very much, no doubt, remains to be done for raising the standard of popular education in our schools. I believe that a well-organized system of diocesan inspection would be likely to exert a very beneficial influence on their character. But the means of establishing one have not hitherto presented themselves in the diocese; nor was it to be expected, under the ordinary circumstances of the clergy, that they should readily be found. Feeling that without some such aid we might lose much of the fruit to be looked for from the efforts which have been made among us in the cause of education, I have endeavoured in some measure to supply the deficiency by an arrangement which has enabled me to secure the assistance of one of the Organizing Masters of the National Society, Mr. Stammers. He will devote the last three months of this year to a portion of our schools, and in course of time will, I hope, have completed the circuit of the whole, leaving traces of his presence in manifold improvements of their methods and spirit, while the information which he will have gathered in all parts of the diocese may furnish a groundwork for fresh endeavours to give an impulse to the work in quarters where it has hitherto languished.

State of education.

This subject is closely connected with another which I wish to commend to your most earnest attention, as one on which I might almost venture to say above every other the success of your ministrations among the young of your flocks must depend. You are aware that in many, perhaps more or less in all, parts of this diocese the announcement of an approaching Confirmation is the signal for renewed efforts on the part of our adversaries to prejudice the poorer or the unlearned and unstable members of our congregations against the rite, and to induce them to keep their children away from it. This is done, I believe, not so much by means of arguments, sound or unsound, against the real doctrine or practice of the Church, as by means of gross misstatements with regard to the nature and object of the rite, the offspring very probably of genuine ignorance in their authors. It would be needless, I am persuaded, to exhort you to use all faithful diligence, as you are expressly bound by your ordination vows, to counteract such attempts, or rather to anticipate them; and as you find opportunity, either by the circulation of tracts, or by oral instruction, or by both together, to put your simple parishioners on their guard against them.

Opposition to Confirmation.

But the point to which I would now more especially call your attention relates to the preparation of those who are brought to be confirmed. I cannot help fearing that in most cases, even where the religious instruction is most carefully conducted by the clergyman himself, that preparation does not begin early enough. I am afraid it often happens that the child is made to learn the Catechism without ever gaining a clear notion of the connection between it and Confirmation: that it is considered rather as an arbitrary condition of admission to the rite, than as a necessary preparation for it.

Connection between Catechism and Confirmation.

In the Prayer Books of Edward the Sixth the office bears the title, "CONFIRMATION. *Wherein is contained a Catechism for children.*" And the Preface (from which that now in use is abridged) is immediately followed by the Catechism, of course without the exposition of the Sacraments which was afterwards added to it. In the present formulary the place of the Catechism is occupied by the

short question addressed by the bishop to the candidates, and the answer to be made by each of them in the words *I do*. Now though I should not wish to see a revival of the ancient practice of a public catechizing on these occasions, even if circumstances permitted it, I am inclined to think that the severance consequent upon its discontinuance between the Catechism and the Confirmation Service in our Prayer Book, has been attended with the unhappy effect of diverting attention from the fact of their intimate relation to one another, and thus has tended to obscure the full import of each. Perhaps I may be allowed to observe by the way that whenever the time shall arrive for a revision of our occasional Services, it will deserve to be considered whether the present Preface of the Confirmation Office does not admit of material improvement. To me it seems liable to the twofold objection of saying too much and too little. It superfluously vindicates what no one would now impugn, the practice of the Reformed Church to defer the rite until the candidate has come to years of discretion, and is capable of confirming his baptismal vow with his own mouth and consent; but it omits all reference to the other side of the subject, which in the earlier Preface is indicated by the words, "Forasmuch as Confirmation is ministered to them that be baptized, that by imposition of hands and prayer they may receive strength and defence against all temptations to sin and the assaults of the world and the devil; it is most meet to be ministered when children come to that age, that partly by the frailty of their own flesh, partly by the assaults of the world and the devil, they begin to be in danger to fall into sin." It is true that in the subsequent part of the present Office this sense of the word Confirmation and the corresponding aspect of the rite are brought most prominently, indeed exclusively, into view. But this does not seem to be a reason for passing over them in total silence in the introductory address to the congregation. But to return from this digression.

Their severance injurious.

It appears to me that the child's mind cannot be too early directed to the public profession of faith and obedience which it will have to make in Confirmation, and its consequent admission

into the full fellowship and the highest privileges of the Church of Christ, as the immediate object of all the instruction it receives in the Catechism. This is the point to which all the teaching of the Catechism should be brought to converge. It is only by reference to this that it can be seen in its true light, its highest unity, and its fullest practical interest. The part, more especially, which treats of the Sacraments must appear, without such a reference, utterly aimless and fruitless. It is not sufficient that this view should be opened only a short time before the solemn act is to take place. It should be presented from the beginning, so as to be constantly growing clearer and more familiar to the learner's mind and heart. Then, when the time has come to prepare him more directly to take an intelligent part in the Confirmation Office by a careful study of its contents, he will be able more readily to understand, that the question which he will have to answer really implies all that he had before learnt on the principles of faith and duty in the Catechism, and will be more likely to be duly impressed with its solemnity and importance. Thus too he will be led more clearly to perceive the connection between his new profession and a diligent use of the means of grace in which he may find strength faithfully to adhere to it. I am persuaded that such a course of preparation will be found the best adapted to a threefold end: to promote a more devout and profitable participation in the Confirmation rite; to increase the number of our young communicants; and to train up intelligent and attached members of our Church, who will be proof against all attempts made to draw them away from her communion. I will only add that, as it has hitherto been my endeavour both to vary and multiply the places of Confirmation, and it is my intention to continue so to do, I shall be thankful for any suggestion which may help me to carry out that object, and to bring the benefit of the ordinance within easy access from each of your parishes.

Early preparation for Confirmation.

There remains one other topic which I may not pass over in silence, though I do not think it necessary or proper to dwell upon it on this occasion as its importance deserves, and as under

different circumstances I might have felt it my duty to do. Statements have been put forward by a dignitary of our Church, in an elaborate work on the Holy Eucharist,* which to many have appeared to be utterly at variance with the teaching of our Church. This is a matter which might not unfitly have occupied some considerable share of our time on such an occasion as this. But as it was till lately generally understood that it was to be submitted to a judicial investigation, I conceived that it would be premature and unseasonable for me to enter into the discussion of a question which was likely ere long to receive a legal determination. The author himself in a more recent Charge has expressed himself well pleased with the prospect of 'any legal process which must result in his being enabled to teach with greater confidence, or to refrain from teaching with greater satisfaction.' Within the last month, however, he has resigned his ecclesiastical preferments, and has withdrawn from the ministry, though not from the communion of our Church. But he has declared that he has taken this step on grounds quite distinct from his opinions on the Eucharist, and not because he admits any of those contained in his work to be inconsistent with the formularies of our Church. He appears to be still convinced, as he stated himself to be in the Charge, that any attempt to obtain a judicial condemnation of his opinions on this head would be "obviously futile," because he thinks that the latitude left by the decision of the Supreme Court of Appeal on the doctrine of baptismal regeneration must be extended to his opinions with regard to the other sacrament. "If," he argues, "it is open to men to deny that regeneration attends Baptism, how can they be prevented from affirming the Real Presence?" I cannot but lament that any one should take such a view of the effect of that decision. But how far the argument is of any force in this particular case, is just one of the points on which I should have been loath to forestall the judgment of the competent authority, and which it would now be doubly

Wilberforce's doctrine of the Holy Eucharist.

* "The Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist," by Robert Isaac Wilberforce, A.M., Archdeacon of the East Riding.

superfluous to discuss. I have indeed been tempted to suspect, so far as is consistent with the fullest belief in the author's sincerity and earnestness, that a wish to bring this question to the test may have had some influence, consciously or unconsciously, on the composition of the treatise, in which, while a great number of passages exhibit a startling proximity to Romish doctrine, there are others by which they are so qualified and almost neutralized, that it is by no means easy to determine their exact import. I must, however, remark that such a mode of stating the question as that which I have just cited sounds strangely when we recollect the title of Jeremy Taylor's work, "The Real Presence and Spiritual of Christ in the blessed Sacrament proved against the Doctrine of Transubstantiation," and the words of Bishop Cosin, in his History of Transubstantiation: "None of the Protestant Churches doubt of the real (that is, true and not imaginary) presence of Christ's body and blood in the Sacrament." Nothing in this question can depend on the expression, *Real Presence;* everything on the sense which is attached to it.

But farther, it is remarkable that the author in his Charge endeavours to vindicate the soundness of his doctrine by a reference to the language of the Catechism and the Communion Service, but has not there thought it worth while to show its conformity to the teaching of the Articles. Yet it is clear that the Articles are at least a part of the standard by which the orthodoxy of a divine of our Church must be tried. In the work itself reference is here and there made to the 28th Article, chiefly for the purpose of showing that there is only a verbal contradiction between it and the doctrine of transubstantiation, as held by Aquinas and the other schoolmen, and confirmed by the Council of Trent, against which it has commonly been supposed to be levelled, and that it was really meant to censure a far more ancient and long-exploded error, which would have been equally rejected by Aquinas and the other schoolmen, that is, the carnal or Capernaite notion of a natural or fleshly presence of Christ, in the Sacrament.* English

The Articles a standard of orthodoxy.

* P. 1-8.

Churchmen," he observes,* "hold of course, as our Article declares, and as Aquinas would not have denied, that according to that popular sense of the word *substance* which implies it to be an object to the senses of men, the substance of the elements remains unchanged. But in reference to that more subtile explanation which was designed by Aquinas, they simply withhold their judgment." I am not sure whether any other English Churchman has put the same interpretation on the Article.† But the author by whom I believe it was first proposed was the Franciscan friar, Franciscus a Sancta Clara, who in the reign of Charles I. undertook to reconcile the Thirty-nine Articles with the doctrines of the Church of Rome. When he comes to the 28th, finding that the second paragraph sounded very much as if it was a denial of transubstantiation, he observes: "This Article then must be glossed; as only meant to condemn the ancient error of the Capernaites, of a carnal presence of Christ, that is, as though Christ existed in the Sacrament in a natural or carnal manner, and was chewed by our teeth."‡ The authority of this commentator is not perhaps one which would commend his interpretation to many English Churchmen. But certainly it is desirable that all should know which of these doctrines it is that their Church condemns, as one which "is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, over-

* P. 296.

† Waterland (works, vol. viii. p. 243), after having given an account of the opinions of Anastasius (who is quoted in "The Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist," p. 166, as holding the Capernaite notion censured in the 28th Article), and of the kindred doctrine imputed to Damascen, observes: "No *transubstantiation* (such as the Romanists hold) was yet invented." He seems not to have been aware that either this notion of Anastasius, or that of the Capernaites, and not any which the Romanists hold, was condemned by the Article, under the name of Transubstantiation. See Appendix.

‡ "Deus, Natura, Gratia," p. 306: "Negare Transubstantiationem divinam in hoc tremendo mysterio est contra veritatem fidei, prout definitum est in Lateranensi et Trid. . . . . Debet igitur glossari hic Articulus; eos scilicet solum condemnare antiquum errorem Capharnaitarum, sc. carnalem præsentiam Christi, id est, quasi Christus modo naturali seu carnali hic existeret, et dentibus nostris masticetur." In point of fact, there is no reason to believe that the Capernaite notion was ever entertained by any human being, except the persons who misunderstood our Lord's words at Capernaum in the way related by St. John. Nor does the argument of Anastasius appear to me to have even the remotest connexion with it. As a doctrine it never existed. According to the interpretation of Sancta Clara the object of the Article was to gainsay that which nobody ever affirmed.

throweth the nature of a Sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions," and should not confound it with another from which they simply withhold their judgment, because they do not admit the authority of the Council of Trent, but which they are at liberty to treat as an open question, and, as a matter of private opinion, to adopt or deny at their pleasure.

There is another point which seems to call for more special notice and on which it may not be unseasonable to offer a remark.

Object of Wilberforce's treatise.

The object of the treatise is not merely speculative. It is designed to lead to certain practical conclusions, which are stated in the last chapter, and which have an immediate and important bearing on the ritual and public worship of the Church. The author observes that, with regard to the frequency of celebrating the Eucharist, our modern practice has departed very widely from that of primitive times, when that celebration was the great act of devotion which occupied the Church in all her public assemblies, especially on every Lord's day.* He shows that this abandonment of the ancient usage was not contemplated by our Reformers, but was the undesigned result of an innovation which was introduced with a totally different object in the Communion Service in the second book of Edward VI. In this the prayer for the Church militant was followed by an Exhortation, to be addresed

* It is interesting to observe that, while the want of a liturgy is beginning to be felt by English Nonconformists, a conviction is gaining ground among the German Protestants that it is desirable to restore the Holy Communion to the place which it occupied in the worship of the primitive Church. In an elaborate paper, read by Dr. Schoeberlein before a conference of the Baden ministers, and published in the "Studien und Kritiken," 1854, 2, the author observes, p. 221, "It is felt more and more as a defect in our system, that the sermon absorbs everything else, and forms the central point of divine worship, so as to reduce all its other parts to the rank of accessaries preliminary or supplemental to it For the consequence of this is, that the people are left to depend for their edification almost wholly on the minister's individual capacity and temporary frame of mind. And how deplorable is the lot of a congregation when its minister lacks the gift of fluency, above all, when he preaches his own opinion instead of the word of God! Under these circumstances the want which forces itself irrepressibly upon us, is that a more objective character should be given to our worship by means of a more fully-developed liturgy, with appointed Scripture lessons, and more copious forms of prayer; and that the Sacrament should recover its proper position in the weekly service, in which from the first it formed the culminating point."

to the whole congregation, "at certain times when the curate shall see the people negligent to come to the Holy Communion," in which they are admonished not to "stand by as gazers and lookers on them that do communicate, and be no partakers of the same themselves;" and then, after some farther urgent appeals, come the words: "Wherefore, rather than you should so do, depart you hence, and give place to them that be godly disposed." I think it may be doubted, on a comparison of the context, whether this exhortation was really intended to prevent every one who was not prepared to communicate from remaining during the rest of the service. But such appears to have been its actual operation. And as, at the same time, it was directed that there should be no celebration of the Lord's Supper, except there were "a good number to communicate with the priest according to his discretion," the further consequence was, that the administration became less and less frequent, and in many places confined to a few Sundays in the year. On the revision of the Prayer Book in 1662, that which the author calls the "sentence of exclusion," contained in the earlier book, was omitted; and thus he observes, "it became possible for all who were in the Church's communion to take part again on all occasions in the Eucharistic sacrifice. But the habit of attending, once lost, was not easily recovered." It may be added that the "sentence" (if it is to be so called) appears to have been omitted simply because it had become superfluous, and referred to a state of things which had long ceased to exist. For the revised office evidently proceeds on the supposition that none but those who "mind to come to the Holy Communion" are present at the administration. And I cannot assent to the author's statement that "the omission of the 'order' in question is equivalent to its direct repeal." Still it must be admitted that the present practice is entirely optional, and that every member of the congregation is at liberty to remain until the end of the service, though without any intention of communicating; and it may even be fairly questioned whether there are not many cases in which, with due precaution, the exercise of this right might be

Why the sentence of exclusion was omitted.

highly beneficial, and worthy of encouragement. I also believe that there is a growing conviction in the minds of many, both of the clergy and the laity, that the introductory portion of the Communion Service which is read every Sunday, even when no Communion is intended to follow, is not only a most unsatisfactory substitute for the full ritual, but, apart from the rest, is hardly intelligible without the aid of a palpable fiction; and therefore that the present rule with regard to it most urgently calls for revision; and I will own that I entirely concur in this opinion, and should rejoice if Convocation found itself in a condition to deal with this subject.

Dissent from Wilberforce's conclusions.

But while so far I agree with the author's statements on this head, I totally dissent from his practical conclusions. He complains of the difference between our present practice and the usage of antiquity. But the reform which he suggests is that we should revert, not to the primitive usage, according to which there was never a celebration of the Eucharist without a Communion, but to that of later times, which our Reformers deliberately abolished, when they required that there should be some to communicate with the priest at every celebration of the Lord's Supper. He cites* with evident approbation a remark of Bishop Cosin on a canon of a Romish council, in which it is declared that in their opinion it was improper for a priest to sing mass unless some one else was present to make the responses. Cosin questions the soundness of this opinion, and thinks it "better to endure the absence of the people than for the minister to neglect the usual and daily sacrifice of the Church, by which all people, whether they be there or no, reap so much benefit;" and such he alleges to have been the opinion of Bishop Overall. Our author, however, contents himself with proposing that "any priest who could induce his people to give its due prominence to the Eucharistic office should at once resume the ancient usage," that is, the usage of celebrating the Eucharist without any Communion, unless the reception of the elements by the priest himself may be so called. In what material point such a service

* P. 142.

would differ from the modern mass it would not be easy to say; and it is a question which those who share the author's views on the 28th Article may regard as of little moment. To others it will appear, as it does to myself, one of the gravest importance; according to my view, far outweighing any that have been mooted as to the effect of consecration in the Eucharist, which may be so treated as to turn on mere metaphysical subtleties, quite foreign to the province of theology. I hope and trust that no clergyman of our Church will adopt the author's suggestion, and be guilty of such an abuse of our Communion Service as to read it either alone in the church, or before a congregation consisting entirely of persons who come only to gaze and look on, and are not expected really to partake in it. But any authoritative sanction of such a proceeding on the part of the Church would, in my judgment, be little less than an act of suicide, a virtual apostasy, by which, instead of approximating more nearly to primitive usage, she would fall away into the latest and worst corruption by which her Lord's institution has been perverted, through the unhappy development of the Church of Rome; no longer the Lord's Supper, but the sacrifice of the mass. Rather, my brethren, while we acknowledge and lament the departure from apostolical practice which was the result of that mediæval development, and which our Reformers were unable completely to redress; while we strive by all lawful means to remedy this evil, by multiplying opportunities of receiving the Holy Communion in our congregations, let it be matter of comfort and thankfulness to us to reflect, that at least we have been permitted to preserve the substance and spirit of the ordinance unimpaired, and in a form which may safely challenge comparison with any other now extant; and that our rite, whenever celebrated, is in deed, as in name, whatever else it may be, an "administration of the Lord's Supper, or the Holy Communion." May we never either change the name or lose the thing!

A return to the Sacrifice of the Mass.

The work to which I have been adverting has now lost the importance which it derived from the author's station in the Church, and

is left, with no other than that which it owes to the learning and ability displayed in it, to the test of literary discussion, in which the Church has no interest at stake, and by which the truth cannot lose, but may even in some degree gain; though for the sake of peace we should have deprecated the revival of a controversy, in which charity has been so often sacrificed to dogmatical presumption, and barren speculation on questions manifestly outreaching the grasp of our faculties. But there appears to be reason to expect that we may still have to witness the institution of judicial proceedings on the same subject in another case; one in which statements which might otherwise, perhaps, have been fitly passed over in silence, have been thought to deserve the distinction of a judicial investigation, on account of the author's official position, and more especially of the peculiar circumstances through which he was enabled to attempt to force his private opinion on the Church, as a condition of admission into holy orders, so as to exclude all who hold with Hooker,* that "the real presence of Christ's most blessed body and blood is not to be sought for in the Sacrament, but in the worthy receiver of the Sacrament."† As to the expediency of such a course I have no need to inquire. I should not indeed think it consistent either with the dignity or the welfare of our Church to give such prominence to every theological aberration, however offensive in itself, into which a clergyman may be betrayed, whether by deficiency of learning, weakness of judgment, or love of notoriety. But in the present instance there may be sufficient grounds for considering this as a necessary evil. That it is an evil, or a necessity deeply to be deplored, will hardly be denied. For under the present constitution of the Court of Appeal in cases of false doctrine, the decision can only affect the individual concerned in his official character and his temporal interests, and will leave him and all other members of the Church as much as ever at liberty to believe that his opinions are in accordance with her teaching.

Anticipated judicial proceedings.

Such proceedings a necessary evil.

* E. P., V. c. 67, 6.

† From the Appendix to Archdeacon Denison's "Third Sermon on the Real Presence," p. 174, it would appear that the question now is, whether a person may *receive the body and blood of Christ*, and yet be *in no wise a partaker of Christ*. The author holds the affirmative, and yet believes that he takes a *high* view of the Sacrament.

Legally it will be binding upon him; but morally it will only have the weight of a more or less probable opinion, resting entirely on the validity of the reasons which may be alleged in support of it. A ban will, it may be, have been placed upon certain modes of expression; but it will remain as much as ever an open question, whether the doctrine which they represent is sanctioned or condemned by the Church. The advantage of such coercion, small and questionable as it is, will have to be purchased by the profanation of the most awful mysteries of our religion in a scene of forensic debate; and the issue, whatever it may be, will be sure to afford a welcome handle to our enemies, for assailing the Church on that side on which she is at present left unguarded, through the defects of her legal organization.

Under these circumstances the stirring of such a controversy must be viewed by every friend of our Church with much concern, not unmixed with some measure of uneasiness. Still I see nothing in the prospect before us, even in this quarter, seriously to alloy the more cheerful feelings which I expressed at the outset; nothing to forbid the hope that even these apparently untoward incidents may be overruled for our good. There are, indeed, two contingencies in which the result of the proceedings rumoured to be now impending would inflict real injury on the Church. The one, if any thing should be done to countenance the notion that our existing formularies do not clearly and decidedly repudiate the Romish doctrine, both of the Sacrament and the sacrifice in the Eucharist: that it is only the names of transubstantiation and of the sacrifices of masses that they reject, but that they do not exclude the things; so that our most eminent divines who have vindicated what they conceived to be the truth held by our Church against Romish error have really been fighting with shadows, understanding neither what they defended nor what they assailed. The other hardly less unhappy result would be, that any new restrictions should be imposed on the freedom of opinion hitherto allowed to the ministers of our Church, so as in effect to narrow the terms of her communion. But I see no cause to apprehend either of these evils; and I am very sure that there is no need of falling into the one to avoid the

Prospects of the Church.

other. There is no real discord between the interests of truth and of peace; and both will, I doubt not, be found compatible with as large a measure of liberty of thought as was ever enjoyed in our Reformed Church at any previous period of her history. I believe that our ancient landmarks are inscribed with sufficiently plain and legible characters for all who have a mind to read, and that we have only to take care that they be neither disfigured nor removed. My hope and trust is that the vigour and energy of the Church, as they are more and more drawn forth to objects of practical usefulness, will throw off the peccant humours by which she has been vexed, and restore the whole body to health and soundness; and that this end will be accomplished without either any loss of her members, or the curtailment of any of their rightful privileges.

Concluding advice.

In the meanwhile, let us not lose sight of the important distinction between that which is positive, and that which is merely negative in these matters. It was with reference to the very controversy which has been just revived, that Hooker observed: "Seeing that by opening the several opinions which have been held, they are grown for aught I can see on all sides at the length to a general agreement concerning that which alone is material, namely the *real participation* of Christ, and of life in His body and blood, *by means of this Sacrament:* wherefore should the world continue still distracted and rent with so manifold contentions, when there remaineth now no controversy saving only about the subject *where* Christ is?"* The lapse of between two and three centuries has not rendered this question less pertinent and weighty in our day. The fact, indeed, which drew forth Hooker's exclamation is easily explained. In this, as in other disputes, while the spirit of charity dwells most on that which it affirms, the spirit of contention is ever seeking to magnify the importance of that which it denies. It behoves every one to take heed which spirit he is of, and to cherish that which alone proceeds from Him whose office it is to guide faithful and loving minds into all truth.

* E. P., V. 67, 2.

APPENDIX.

It is remarkable that the Church of Rome, toward which some in our day have professed to be attracted by the precision of her dogmatical statements, has in the Council of Trent given two definitions of transubstantiation widely different from one another: the one affording some advantage in controversy with gainsayers; the other opening the widest field for the grossest popular superstitions. According to the one, by the consecration of the bread and wine the whole *substance* of the bread is changed into the *substance* of the body of Christ, and the whole *substance* of the wine into the *substance* of His blood; that is, one metaphysical entity is substituted for another, equally beyond the grasp of the human mind, and equally incapable of any predicate by which it may become the subject of an intelligible proposition. According to the other definition, the whole substance of the bread is changed into the body, and the whole substance of the wine into the blood of Christ; so that His whole person (totus et integer Christus) is to be conceived as present in the consecrated host, with all its sensible properties, only miraculously hidden from the senses. The first definition occurs Sess. xii. Cap. iv.: "Sancta hæc Synodus declarat, per consecrationem panis et vini conversionem fieri totius substantiæ panis in substantiam corporis Christi Domini nostri, et totius substantiæ vini in substantiam sanguinis ejus. Quæ conversio convenienter et propriè a sancta Catholica Ecclesia Transubstantiatio est appellata." The other in Canon II. of the same session: "Si quis dixerit, in sacrosancto Eucharistiæ Sacramento remanere substantiam panis et vini una cum corpore et sanguine Domini nostri Jesu Christi, negaveritque mirabilem illam et singularem conversionem totius substantiæ panis in corpus, et totius substantiæ vini in sanguinem manentibus dumtaxat speciebus panis et vini: quam quidem conversionem Catholica Ecclesia aptissimè Transubstantiationem appellat; anathema sit." In "The Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist" it is stated (p. 294) "that the theory maintained by Aquinas (which is supposed to be that of the Council of Trent) was, that the *substance* of our Lord's body and blood supersedes that of the bread and wine." But this statement seems to me inconsistent with the language of

Aquinas (in Lib. iv. Sent. Dist. viii. qu. 2): "In termino transubstantiationis substantia quæ erat terminus a quo (that is, the bread) non manet quantum ad naturam speciei (its proper substance) sed solum quantum ad accidentia quibus ejus individuatio cognoscebatur: sed substantia quæ est terminus ad quem (the body of Christ) in termino transubstantiationis continetur in Sacramento integrè, et quo ad naturam speciei, et quo ad accidentia propria," that is, the *substance* of the bread is superseded, not merely by the *substance* of our Lord's body, but by the substance and accidents together (totus et integer Christus), though the senses are not permitted to perceive the accidents which are really present in the Sacrament. This is manifestly the notion which lies at the bottom of the "miracle of Bolsena," and other like legends, in which the supernatural veil was supposed to be for a moment partially withdrawn: "Ut quod latebat in mysterio, patesceret adhuc dubitantibus in miraculo." Paschasius Radbertus, *De Corpore et Sanguine Domini*, c. 14, where several of these stories are related; as also by Durandus, *De Corp. et Sang. Chr.* ad fin. Opp. Lanfranci, p. 8. In the council held at Rome by Nicolas II., Berengarius was compelled to confess, "Christi corpus sensualiter sacerdotum manibus tangi et frangi." One school of Romanist divines understands this literally, contending that by virtue of a quasi-hypostatic union between Christ and the accidents of the bread, and a consequent *communicatio idiomatum*, whatever is said of the accidents may be said of Christ, as truly and properly as it might be of the bread if it were present. Others will only adopt such language in a figurative sense; and this Bellarmine (*De Eucharist.* i. c. 2) states to be "sententia Theologorum communis," and that which he himself prefers. But neither of these opinions had anything to do with the Capernaite mistake.

VI.

A CHARGE

DELIVERED OCTOBER, 1857.

THE DOGMA OF THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION.—EUCHARISTIC CONTROVERSY IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.—REV. R. WILLIAMS' "RATIONAL GODLINESS."

MY REVEREND BRETHREN,

I CANNOT address you on this occasion without being reminded of that great change in the state of public affairs which has taken place since our last meeting. The restoration of European peace is an event which affects all interests in the community, even those which are most purely spiritual. For as even these depend in part on material instruments and agencies, they are liable to suffer, more or less, whenever a considerable portion of the national wealth is absorbed by objects which, however important and necessary, are foreign to those interests, especially when the public attention and concern are in the same degree withdrawn from them. We have therefore had reason to be thankful, not only as Christians, for the cessation of one of the sorest evils that afflict mankind, but also as Churchmen, for the removal of burdens and hindrances which interfered with our proper work. And our thankfulness must be heightened even by the calamitous events which are now passing, when we reflect that it has been through that mercy—little as some of us valued it at the time—that we have been enabled to put forth our undivided strength to meet the danger which threatens our empire in the East. But we have had a motive for still deeper

gratitude in that gracious overruling of Divine Providence, by which good was evolved out of evil. The gloomy season of sorrow and anxiety through which we were led, was brightened by glorious examples of heroic charity, which have not passed away with the immediate occasion, but have yielded good and, we trust, lasting fruit, in the upgrowth or improvement of institutions for the mitigation of human suffering, and in the new impulse given to all benevolent exertions for like ends. And while we rejoice at this gain to humanity, we cannot but regard it as a hopeful sign for the diffusion and increase of pure religion, that the termination of the eventful struggle has been commemorated by a monument of pious gratitude in which our Church will be witnessing to the truth of the Gospel in the midst of the unbelievers with whom we were allied for the protection of their political independence, and will at the same time be enabled to hold out the hand of Christian fellowship to the ancient Churches of the East, which, however they may have declined from primitive purity of doctrine or practice, are not separated from her by any such insurmountable barrier as is raised by the pretensions of the Roman Papacy. And may we not humbly hope—as we ought undoubtedly to pray, and as far as lies in us in our several spheres, to labour—that our present sharp trial may in like manner, but in a far higher degree, be made instrumental for the like salutary ends?

I have glanced at this feature of our late struggle the more gladly, because in so many other quarters the signs of the times appear to me much less cheering with regard to the prospects of the Church. On every side I observe tokens of a spirit which seems to me fraught with mischief and danger, and which no one who has at heart, I do not say the honour and welfare of our Church, but the interests of Christianity, can view without sorrow and uneasiness. I allude to the growing prevalence of dogmatical intolerance, exhibiting itself sometimes in slight offences against charity, which only kindle irritation and heart-burning in particular circles, sometimes in forms which threaten nothing less than a disruption in the Church at large,

Prevalence of intolerance.

and which, even if they should not issue in so lamentable a catastrophe, tend to produce a state of chronic discord and ill-feeling. Things in themselves indifferent are made party badges and shibboleths, to which the one side clings the more tenaciously because they are vehemently disliked on the other. Ambiguous terms and practices are studiously selected and brought prominently forward, because they bear an obnoxious meaning, while by others such a meaning is fastened on the most innocent usages and expressions. The fullest and worst demonstration of this intolerant spirit is an eagerness for the making of new heresies, an endeavour to contract the terms of admission into the Church or its ministry, so as to exclude or disquiet all who do not belong to the favoured party. If such attempts should succeed, it is easy to see the nature, though impossible to measure the extent, of the calamity which would ensue. In the meantime the contests to which they gave rise waste the Church's strength, shake the confidence and chill the affections of her most intelligent and attached members, and afford not only matter of exultation and triumph, but real advantage to her adversaries.

All this, indeed, is nothing new. It is no more than has occurred at other periods in the history of our Church. Rather it may be said that there has never been one in which the evil has not been more or less felt. What induces me to notice it now is, that it appears to me to be gaining ground, assuming a more and more threatening aspect, ramifying into a greater multiplicity of hateful forms, infecting the life-blood of the Church with growing virulence, and paralysing healthy action in the same degree that it keeps up a morbid excitement. If such be the case, it is but poor comfort to know that this spirit is not confined to our own communion. There may be others in which it has been far more widely and habitually dominant. But then we have been used to hear our own Church commended in contrast to them on this very ground. For such a spirit is directly opposed to that *moderation* which has been often and, on the whole, justly claimed as one of her most characteristic qualities. It is true however that the Papal Church has very recently exhibited an

Not confined to our own Church.

instance of such intolerance, which is perhaps, in all its circumstances, without a parallel even in the annals of that Church. And the subject is one which seems to me to deserve our attention, both as holding out an instructive warning, and because it affects the character and constitution of the Church of Rome in a way which ought to be clearly understood.

You are no doubt aware, that within the last three years an event has taken place in that Church, which all sincere Romanists, whatever they may think of it, must regard as of the very highest importance. It is the addition of a new article of faith to those which they had been previously bound to profess: namely, the tenet of the Immaculate Conception, or exemption of the Virgin Mary from all stain of original sin, which was publicly proclaimed at Rome with the utmost solemnity, and announced to all members of the Roman communion, by a Papal Bull, dated the 8th of December, 1854. The doctrine itself has two aspects, the one negative, the other positive. On the one hand, it denies the singularity of that perfect sinlessness, which we, in common with all the reformed confessions, ascribe exclusively to our blessed Lord. On the other hand, it invests the Virgin Mary with an equal share of this attribute. I am not going to discuss this new dogma from the Protestant—which is the primitive and catholic—point of view, or to repeat the proofs which have been accumulated, not only by Protestant, but by Romanist authors, of its irreconcilable repugnance, not only to Scripture, but to all pure and authentic tradition, as handed down by the most eminent doctors of the Church of Rome itself. Great as is the innovation in doctrine, it is of slight importance in comparison with that which has been effected in the constitution of the Papal Church, by the way in which the dogma has been introduced. New articles of faith have from time to time been added to the Romish creed. But it has been done heretofore by the authority of the Pope in council. The recent addition has been made by the individual Pope, acting on a claim of personal infallibility and absolute power, which though often advanced, and zealously maintained

Doctrine of the Immaculate Conception.

Promulgated by the Pope individually.

by the ultramontane party, which is now every where in the ascendant, has never yet been established or recognised by any decree of their Church. Accordingly, notwithstanding the prevalence of that party, several members of the Roman communion openly deny that the Pope has power to impose a new article of faith, and contend that his recent act is null and void. A French priest—a man of unimpeached character and orthodoxy, according to the previous Roman standard—was delegated by some of his co-religionists, both clergy and laity, to protest against the threatened innovation, and had the courage to present such a protest at Rome before the publication of the Bull. But instead of gaining a hearing, he was forced immediately to quit the Papal territory, and has since, I believe, paid the penalty of his honesty and zeal for the truth, in a death of miserable destitution. But he has left an account of the whole transaction, which sheds the clearest light on the character of the proceedings by which the object was accomplished.* All appear to have been arbitrary, irregular, and illusory. There was an affectation of consulting the bishops, first by an Encyclic Letter,† framed in terms of studied equivocation,‡ and afterwards by an invitation to personal attendance at Rome. But those who assembled there were expressly informed that they were to have no voice in the definition of doctrine, and in fact were only employed to heighten the pomp of the ecclesiastical pageant in the ceremony of the promulgation. The means adopted to enforce

His power to do it disputed.

* His little work, entitled "Relation et Mémoire des Opposants au nouveau dogme de l'Immaculée Conception, et à la Bulle Ineffabilis, par M. l'Abbé Laborde," has been bought up, and it is now difficult to procure a copy. It is to be wished that it was made more generally known in England, by means of a good translation, as the narrative part is full of curious and instructive particulars.

† Issued from Gaeta, during the Pope's exile, after his flight from Rome in 1848.

‡ The inquiry is: "Significare velitis qua *devotione* vester Clerus Populusque fidelis erga Immaculatæ Virginis Conceptionem sit animatus, et quo desiderio flagret ut ejusmodi res ab Apostolica sede decernatur." The fraudulent ambiguity of such an inquiry, when the point to be ascertained was the faith of the Church, is well exposed by Laborde, p. 90. The value of the answers sent to such a question may be partly estimated from what he states at p. 47, that at Rome itself, the mass of the people did not know the meaning of the doctrine. "Le peuple proprement dit, la masse ne comprenait pas même ce qu'on voulait faire. . . . Les femmes et les filles pratiquant la religion, croyaient qu'on allait décider que la sainte Vierge est vierge, et se montraient scandalisées que les prêtres ne fussent pas d'accord sur ce point."

the reception of the new dogma, appear to have been worthy of those which were used to silence all opposition, before it was decreed. In France an organized system of persecution, conducted by a so-called religious journal, has been brought to bear on the clergy who showed a disposition to withhold their concurrence.* But the general acquiescence in this last strain of the Papal prerogative, though obviously incapable of rendering it one jot the more legitimate, will no doubt practically establish and perpetuate it, and will probably encourage future Popes to emulate its author by fresh, and, if possible, still grosser corruptions of Christianity.†

The point however to which I wish to draw your attention, is quite distinct from this, and wholly independent of the truth or falsehood of the dogma itself, and it is one in which there is no need to rely on any statement, however credible, which might be questioned as proceeding from an adverse partisan. For it rests on the most authentic of all possible evidence, that of the declaratory Bull itself. This is indeed a very remarkable document, as proving, among other things, how much ignorance, misapprehension, and fallacious reasoning may consist with the Papal claim of infallibility, even in the very act of exercising the asserted prerogative. The present occupier of the chair to which this gift is supposed to be annexed, is generally understood to be very moderately versed in theo-

The Bull, and the claim of infallibility.

* Laborde, p. 102. "Déjà à Paris des curés ont noté d'hérétiques du haut de la chaire, quiconque ne croit pas au nouveau dogme. Déjà des curés ont refusé à des prêtres de leur laisser dire la messe. Déjà des fidèles se sont vu refuser l'absolution. Dans les départements déjà l'agitation remue tout, et le tocsin du journal (l'Univers) anime le fanatisme." And p. 67: "Un journal que soudoie dit-on l'argent même de la Propaganda."

† Cardinal Gousset, Archbishop of Rheims, has published a collection of 665 Letters of Roman Catholic Bishops, partly in answer to the Encyclic of 1849, partly of an earlier date, as part of what he calls a proof of the general and constant belief of the Church in the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception (La Croyance générale et constante de l'Eglise touchant l'Immaculée Conception de la B. V. M.), together with the text of the Bull, and other documents. In this very curious volume, all expressions in the letters which attribute infallibility to the Pope are printed in italics, and at p. 758 the Cardinal draws the reader's attention to the fact, that, with the exception of four or five prelates, who seemed to make their full adhesion to the Pope's judgment depend on that of the majority of their colleagues in the episcopate, none called for the convocation of a general council, none thought such a council necessary.

logy,* and to depend mainly on others for such light as does not come to him in a supernatural way; and the decree to which he has given the stamp of his authority, was evidently drawn up by one who either did not understand, or studiously misrepresented the question discussed in it. Its object is to justify the new definition by a review of the history of the opinion which it erects into an article of faith. There was indeed a difficulty in the way which it required no little dexterity to evade. Even the Pope has never yet claimed the power of making an entirely new revelation in matters of faith. On the contrary, it is stated in this very Bull, that the Church, as a careful guardian of the doctrines committed to her charge, never changes aught in them, neither diminishes nor adds to them; though she labours with all diligence to elucidate and unfold those which were but imperfectly delineated in her earlier teaching, but always so that they retain their substantial identity of dogmatical import.† It was therefore necessary to shew that the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, which the Bull declares to have been revealed by God, had in fact always been held and believed in the Church. The proof offered in support of this assertion is composed of a string of rhetorical phrases (without any reference or means of verification), in which the Fathers have celebrated the purity and sanctity of the Virgin Mary:‡ all as utterly and palpably

Nature of proofs in support of the doctrine.

* Laborde, p. 75. "Le Pape actuel passe pour fort peu initié aux sciences théologiques, et pour peu capable de remuer les profondeurs de la tradition."

† "Christi Ecclesia, sedula depositorum apud se dogmatum custos et vindex, nihil in his unquam permutat, nihil minuit, nihil addit, sed omni industria vetera fideliter sapienterque tractando si qua antiquitus informata sunt, et Patrum fides servit (sic f. servat) ita limare expolire studet, ut prisca illa cœlestis doctrinæ dogmata accipiant evidentiam lucem distinctionem, sed retineant plenitudinem, integritatem, proprietatem, ac in suo tantum genere crescant, in eodem scilicet dogmate, eodem sensu, eademque sententia."

A French translation of the Bull is appended to A. Peyrat's little work, "Un nouveau Dogme," which, among other things, contains some well-selected quotations from writers ancient and modern on the subject.

‡ Laborde, p. 77. "Si le Pape avait examiné, comme il le fallait, la tradition, jamais il n'aurait laissé s'introduire dans une bulle destinée à tout l'univers cette longue tirade de prétendues expressions de Pères." And he proceeds to point out their fraudulent irrelevance: many of them, as he observes, relate not to the conception of the Virgin herself, but to that by which she became the mother of our Lord.

irrelevant to the point for which they are cited, as the single quotation from Scripture — the angelical salutation — which, except in the mistranslation of the Vulgate, would not even appear to have the remotest bearing on the question.*

Progress of belief in it.

But though the Pope, relying on such arguments, does not scruple to affirm that the doctrine was always believed in the Church, even he does not pretend that it was believed by all. On the contrary, he traces the history of its progress, and extols the zeal with which the Church, and especially his own "glorious predecessors," had laboured to propagate it. The numberless passages in the writings of the Fathers, in which it is denied, not only by the clearest implication in the unqualified assertion of the truth which it gainsays, but, as in the famous letter of St. Bernard, by express contradiction and elaborate refutation; the long opposition headed by a monastic order which was regarded as the foremost champion of Romish orthodoxy†—all this is of course passed over in discreet silence. But how far from universal the belief has been down to the latest times, appears clearly on the face of the Bull itself. Toward the end of the fifteenth century a great step was taken in the propagation of the doctrine by the Papal sanction being given to a festival—that which had been condemned by St. Bernard—in honour of the Immaculate Conception. Still gainsayers were found to deny that the festival was meant to decide the question. And in the seventeenth century, after one Pope had declined to declare the doctrine an article of faith, expressly on the ground that it had not been revealed to the Church, another issued a decree forbidding it to be impugned or questioned. That, after silence had been thus enforced on the one side, the belief should have spread, may be easily supposed. But still it is not pretended

* "Gratia plena." The Author of the Bull was perhaps unable to construe *κεχαριτωμένη*. His argument turns entirely on the absolute force of the adjective, which has nothing to answer to it in the original.

† The reader will hardly need to be reminded of the long and hot contest between the Franciscans, the sworn champions, and the Dominicans, the learned antagonists of the Immaculate Conception; or of the scandalous imposture practised at Bern, in 1507, by the Dominicans, the detection of which brought them, and the doctrine which they endeavoured to commend by their pious fraud, into deep discredit.

that it has yet become universal, and the contrary is a notorious fact.

One thing is certain: that, whether the doctrine is ancient or modern, whether held by many or by few, it had never before been a dogma of the Church of Rome. It was reserved for the latter half of the nineteenth century to see that which had previously been no more than a simple belief or opinion, converted into an article of faith. Now for the first time it is promulged as a truth revealed by God, and all members of the Roman communion are enjoined, not as before, to abstain from disputing it, but to believe it in their hearts, under penalty of making shipwreck of the faith, falling away from the unity of the Church, and so forfeiting all their hopes of salvation. This is the consummation which fills the mouth of its author with joy, and his heart with gratitude. This he considers as the great privilege of his reign. Never, he says, will he cease to render most humble and hearty thanks for the singular favour conferred upon him, of having been permitted to offer and decree this honour, this glory, and praise to the mother of our Lord. Let it then be observed wherein precisely this honour and glory consist. It is in the new peril to which, according to the belief of the Pope himself, human souls—how many, he does not pretend to know—have been exposed by his act. It is, that they who before were safe will be liable to shipwreck; that they who were before within, will find themselves outside the pale of the Church. The danger, the probable perdition of these souls, is the tribute of honour, glory, and praise, which he offers to her whom he describes as the creature nearest to God, and the absolute model of perfect holiness.

Not a dogma of the Romish Church until now.

Effects of its promulgation.

And this view of the subject cannot have escaped his notice. It is clearly pointed out in many of the letters sent in answer to his inquiry by his own prelates. One, for instance, an Italian archbishop of his own territory, writes to him expressly for this purpose, stating that for his own part he should rejoice if the doctrine was universally believed, but that he did not see the necessity of making a dogmatical decree on the subject,

Pointed out by his prelates.

which might become a stumbling-block to many.* But this was the very thing which, according to the Pope's view, would exalt the glory, delight the heart, and propitiate the favour of the holiest of created beings. This is the feature which strikes me as the most characteristic and the most repulsive in the whole transaction. The superstitious credulity in which it had its origin,† the artifices by which it was brought about,‡ the absurdity and groundlessness of the figment itself, may all find a parallel. But, as a triumph of intolerance, achieved by the wanton imperilling of human souls, it seems to me to stand nearly alone, and to betray a moral obliquity hardly to be matched in the darkest ages of the mediæval Church.§

The lesson to be learnt from it.

This is an example which may well lead us to examine ourselves, and reflect what spirit we are of. I see much in what is going on around us, which appears to me to differ rather in form than in substance, rather in degree than in kind, from the proceeding which we have been just reviewing. The Pope naturally places himself at the head of the party in his own Church which is not only the most numerous and powerful, but which labours to exalt his authority. He endeavours to crush the feeble dissentient minority, and to tread out the last spark of religious freedom. He launches his spiritual thunderbolts against those who do not submit their convictions to his decree. He subjects them, as far as he can, to the penalties spiritual and temporal of heresy, and, where his arm cannot reach, he is seconded by a virulent and calumnious journal, which hunts down all who dare to retain the obnoxious truth, or to question the authority by which it is

* Urbino. Gousset, p, 633.

† One Leonard de St. Maurice, a missionary, was said to have predicted, in the last century, that the definition of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception would be attended with the termination of all wars throughout the world, the extinction of heresy and schism in the Church, and the exaltation of the Apostolic See. This prophecy appears to have made a deep impression on Pius IX., and, in his exile at Gaeta, he believed that a like revelation had been vouchsafed to himself. See Laborde, p. 76.

‡ Laborde, pp. 67—69.

§ Some further remarks and illustrations will be found in the Appendix A.

proscribed. All this is no more than was to have been expected in such a quarter. But it is painful to think that there should be anything corresponding to it among ourselves. Yet, after making due allowance for difference of circumstances, I cannot help seeing much that essentially resembles it in the spectacle which has been presented of late by our own unhappy divisions. For there too is a contest in which the parties are both in turn calling in the aid of the secular arm against one another, and endeavouring to establish their respective opinions and tastes as the exclusive standard of faith and practice in the Church. Even the so-called religious journal has its counterpart here.

There is, no doubt, a wide difference in the relative importance of the subjects to which these contentions relate; but not so much in that of the points on which they turn, and still less in the spirit which they exhibit. It is the same temper which finds or makes matter of fierce dispute and ruinous litigation in the minutest details of ecclesiastical ornaments, and in the doctrine of the Eucharist; though, no doubt, a right view of the doctrine, even in points not essential, is far more important than a wise rule as to the furniture of the sanctuary. On the proceedings and the judgment which have determined the degree of liberty to be henceforward allowed in the decoration of chancels and communion tables, I see no need, and feel no temptation to speak, except to express my regret that the question should have arisen, and my acquiescence in the decision by which it seems for the present to have been set at rest. The other case to which I have alluded, might invite some observations on the character of the proceedings which have taken place in it; but I abstain from all comments on this part of the subject, as they could answer no purpose, but possibly to irritate the very temper which I deplore. But the occasion seems to call for some remarks on the controversy itself. It is true that it has not, so far as I know, in any way agitated any part of this diocese; but I am not on that account at liberty to presume, connected as it is with our most solemn ministrations, that it can be viewed by any of us with indifference, or that there may not be some among us who have been perplexed

Contentions in our own Church.

by it, and may derive benefit from a correct appreciation of its import. And I believe that I shall be best preparing the way for this, if I begin with a brief statement of the points on which both sides appear to agree.

Doctrine of the Eucharist.

It is admitted on all hands, that the reception of the consecrated elements in the Lord's Supper, is in the nature of means to an end. And as to the end itself, however variously it may be described, there is no dispute among those who profess to hold the doctrine of our Church. All fully assent to the statements contained in her Communion Office, as to the nature of the benefit enjoyed by those who "with a true, penitent heart, and lively faith, receive that holy Sacrament," as consisting in that spiritual union with Christ, which is expressed in the words, mainly borrowed from the language of Scripture, "then we spiritually eat the flesh of Christ, and drink his blood; then we dwell in Christ, and Christ in us; we are one with Christ, and Christ with us." It is no less concordantly admitted on both sides, that the benefit entirely depends on a worthy reception, and that to an unworthy receiver the Sacrament conveys not benefit, but hurt. It is likewise held by all, that whatever also may be the effect of consecration on the bread and wine, it produces no change in their physical substance or qualities. On the other hand, none deny that it produces a relative change in them; as, indeed, it is a merely identical proposition to affirm that the consecrated elements do not remain unconsecrated. Nor again is it disputed on either side, that this change, whatever may be its nature, is precisely the same as that which passed upon the bread and cup at the institution of the Lord's Supper, or consequently, that in some sense, they become, after consecration, the Body and Blood of Christ.

It might well be thought that this simple outline of common doctrine afforded ample room both for pious sentiment and for practical exhortation. And, I believe, it would not be easy to point out any topic connected with it, that could serve to the use of edifying, not comprehended within this range. Only as an arena for controversy, it is not large enough, and must be dilated by speculation on questions which lie outside of it.

In primitive times, and wherever religious feeling was pure and strong, the devout communicant naturally identified the instrument with the object to which it ministered. He thought not of the material elements, but was lost in the contemplation of that which they represented to his inward gaze. It was only as faith was darkened, and love waxed cold, that the nature of the instrument itself, apart from its use, could become matter for speculation and controversy. But in process of time, the language in which the rapturous devotion of the earlier period had found an appropriate utterance, came to be stereotyped into dogmas, and used to fetter all freedom of thought, and to stifle the very feeling which it was originally meant to express. In the same degree as the instrument was really more and more dishonoured by misuse, and so failed to accomplish the object for which it was designed, was it invested with more of outward splendour, which served to divert attention from that object. An efficacy was attributed to the consecration, by which it transmuted the material elements into a different substance, which, from its association with the person of Christ, might become a proper object of adoration, and was not inconsistently believed to possess a virtue which no unworthiness on the part of the receiver could destroy, and which operated like a charm, independently of all internal dispositions which he might bring to meet it.* This was the source of some of the grossest and most noxious superstitions into which the Latin Church had sunk before the Reformation, while it ministered, more perhaps than any other cause, to the influence of those who profited by the popular ignorance and credulity. This was therefore one of the main points in the Protestant controversy with the Church of Rome. The Reformers applied themselves in various ways to bring out that part of the truth which had been so lamentably obscured by the Romish doctrine, and especially by the consequences which naturally flowed from the metaphysical figment of Transubstantiation, which had been

How regarded in primitive times.

Conduct of Reformers respecting it.

* In the eighth century, a statute of Archbishop Boniface of Mayence (in D'Achery's Spic. i. p. 508, ed. 2) declares. "Non licet mortuis Eucharistiam tradi."

imposed, as an article of faith, in the twilight of the thirteenth century, by the same Pope who proclaimed the ferocious crusade against the Albigenses. It is not surprising, it would have been had the case been otherwise, that some of those who were engaged on the Protestant side of this controversy, while they held fast the neglected portion of the truth, should have overlooked that which lay behind the false position of their adversaries. We have the more reason to rejoice and be thankful, that our own Church steered clear of both extremes, and retained the whole of the revealed truth without any human additions. On the one hand, she honours the instrument as one of Divine institution, and in proportion to the great purpose which it was appointed to serve, but only as an instrument, in its proper place and degree, of subordination to that purpose. She does not proscribe, but rather seeks to cherish, that devotional fervour, which identifies it in the pious mind with the thing which it represents; but in her theological definitions she has been careful not to confound them with one another. On the other hand, she is no less decidedly opposed to such a view of this Sacrament as would empty it of all special value, and reduce it to a mere act of devotion, differing from others only in the outward form, which would thus become a bare rite, essentially of the same kind with those of the ceremonial law which were abolished by the Gospel.

Language of our Church not explicit.

It has indeed been made matter of complaint against her, that her language on this subject is not sufficiently explicit and definite: that it lends itself to views and systems which diverge very widely from one another. I fully admit the fact. It is the very thing which, as I conceive, ought to be regarded by every member of her communion as a motive for joy and thankfulness. For it proves that, with respect to this important article of belief and practice, she stands on the same ground as was occupied for more than a thousand years by the universal Church of Christ. During the whole of that period there was no greater uniformity of opinion than now exists among those who differ most from one another in the interpretation of her formularies. Each of the opposite

tendencies, the mystical and the spiritual,* which are now characteristic of conflicting parties within her pale, then also had their representatives, in writers of unquestioned orthodoxy, who now serve to give a fair show of authority to both sides: and it often happens that the same writer is so little consistent in his statements, that he may be cited in favour of either view. It was only in the ninth century, that literary controversy for the first time arose on the subject,† and then it was carried on freely until the eleventh, when the doctrine most favourable to the grossest popular superstition was first established in its ascendancy by brute force; ‡ and it was only in the thirteenth century that it was formally exalted into an article of faith. I must own that it appears to me anything rather than matter for shame or regret, if the Church of England allows nearly as large a liberty of speculation on this mystery, as was enjoyed and exercised for so long a period, including the primitive times, in the whole Catholic Church.

Importance of the controversy.

The dispute on the doctrine of the Eucharist which has lately agitated the Church, has been treated on both sides as one of momentous import. On the one hand we have heard complaints that "a vital doctrine of the Church of England" has been impeached, that an attempt has been made to silence catholic teaching with regard to it, and "to inflict a public penalty on a clergyman, because he holds and teaches the primitive and catholic doctrine of the sacraments wholly apart from the additions and omissions of the Church of Rome:"§ and that "the faith of a vast number of her priests and people is at stake."‖ On the other hand it has been alleged,

* By the *mystical*, I mean that which seems to confound the properties of body and spirit: by the *spiritual*, that which keeps them strictly separate from one another.

† This has lately been denied by Mr. Freeman ("Principles of Divine Service," Introd. to Part II. p. 36 foll.). As it is a point which very nearly involves the essence of the whole controversy, I have examined Mr. Freeman's statements in the Appendix B.

‡ *Gladiis et fustibus*, as Berengar frequently complains. See especially pp. 52, 53.

§ Archdeacon Denison, Preface to Sermon III., on the Real Presence, p. 147.

‖ "Considerations on the Opinion of the Court at Bath," &c., by the Rev. C. S. Grueber, an advocate who caricatures the sophistry which is so unhappily conspicuous in the writings which he defends, but superadds an exuberance of vituperative virulence, from which they are free.

that a main principle of the Reformation has been placed in jeopardy by the teaching against which legal proceedings were instituted: that an error, against which our martyrs contended to the death, has been openly maintained under a slightly modified form by persons occupying a high position in the Church, and therefore that it became a duty to resort to the means provided by the law for the vindication of the outraged truth. After the closest attention which I could give to the subject, I am unable to go this length with either party, and have been led to the conclusion that the dispute, though undoubtedly indicating a wide discrepancy of views and feelings, is in itself mainly a verbal one, which would either never have arisen, or have been easily settled, if there had been an earnest desire for mutual understanding, instead of a disposition to widen the breach.

Catholic teaching.

As to the doctrine indeed which has been brought forward under the imposing title of "catholic teaching," understood in the sense attached to it by its opponents, my own opinion is very clear and decided. I am convinced that it is completely at variance with the mind of the Church of England, as expounded by her Articles, Liturgy, and Catechism; and when a question of orthodoxy is raised within the Church, it is, as I conceive, only by an appeal to her own exposition of her doctrine in her authentic formularies, and not to any other standard, that the question can consistently be tried. I believe however that the so-called catholic teaching, understood as I have said, is no less repugnant both to Scripture and to the whole stream of genuine primitive tradition, though, by means of compilations which are bringing the name of a *catena* into suspicion and disrepute, as equivalent to an engine of polemical delusion, it may be made to appear to have a great mass of patristic evidence in its favour.* I believe that in itself it involves very nearly as many absurdities and contradictions as that of Transubstantiation, from which it differs rather

* A very large part of the passages collected by Dr. Pusey, in his notes on his Sermon, "The Presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist," would be deprived of all, even seeming, relevancy and argumentative value, by the simple insertion of the word *sacramental* or *sacramentally*.

metaphysically than theologically. But every man has a right, especially when he is on his trial, to explain his own opinions and to require that they should be judged according to his own interpretation of them, and not by the construction which may be put upon them by his adversaries. It may be that his explanation is perplexed and obscure: it may involve manifest absurdity and contradiction: it may resolve itself into mere nonsense. But these are things for which, as I conceive, the author is fairly amenable to the bar of literary criticism, not to a tribunal which inflicts penalties affecting civil rights. To sustain a charge of unsound doctrine, involving such penal consequences, nothing, as it appears to me, ought to suffice, but the most direct unequivocal statements, asserting that which the Church denies, or denying that which she asserts.

Ambiguity of terms.

Now in the present case there is peculiar danger of misapprehension and confusion, arising not only from the difficulty and mysteriousness of the subject, but from the ambiguity of the principal terms employed in the controversy. And I think it will be evident that such confusion has actually occurred, if we compare the propositions which were judicially condemned by the Declaration of the Court at Bath, with that which it laid down as the "true and legal exposition" of the Articles which the defendant was charged with impugning. One of the condemned propositions, as cited in the Declaration, runs thus: "That the Body and Blood of Christ, being really present after an immaterial and spiritual manner in the consecrated bread and wine, are therein and thereby given to all and are received by all who come to the Lord's table." It has been made matter of, I think, just complaint, that this statement omits a capital and integral part of the doctrine which it professes to describe: namely, the opposite results of worthy and unworthy receiving, the distinct assertion that the receiving of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper by those receiving unworthily is "unto condemnation," and the equally distinct denial, "that the holy sacraments save 'ex opere operato,' i. e. by the mere act of receiving." How far this omission may have been justified by any technical rules, I am

not competent to say. But I am quite sure that it is absolutely necessary to take into account the part of the doctrine which the Declaration keeps out of sight, in order to appreciate correctly the part which it condemns: and that if truth, not victory, is the object in view, we must place the whole by the side of that which is declared by the Court to be the true and legal exposition of Articles 28 and 29. This exposition stated, "That the Body and Blood of Christ are taken and received by the worthy receivers only, who, in taking and receiving the same by faith, do spiritually eat the Flesh of Christ, and drink His Blood; whilst the wicked and unworthy, by eating the bread and drinking the wine, without faith, do not in any wise eat, take, or receive, the Body and Blood of Christ, being devoid of faith, whereby only the Body and Blood of Christ can be eaten, taken, and received." We have then to consider whether these two statements are really repugnant to one another. And it is clear that they cannot really contradict each other unless they relate to the same thing; and whether they do so or not, must depend on the sense given to the terms, Body and Blood of Christ. But in the defendant's proposition, the Body and Blood of Christ are manifestly the sacramental Body and Blood, that which the bread and wine become after consecration: and that this sacramental Body and Blood are given to all, and taken and received by all, worthy and unworthy, is what no one denies. But in the "true and legal exposition," the same words evidently mean not the sacramental Body and Blood, but something else, the reception of which involves that participation of Christ, which, in accordance with the 29th Article, the defendant's proposition, when fully and fairly stated, expressly denies to be enjoyed by those who receive unworthily. To this indeed it may be objected, that in that proposition the Body and Blood of Christ are distinguished from the consecrated bread and wine, in which nevertheless they are affirmed to be really present. And if nothing had been added to qualify the sense of the proposition, it would indeed be hard to reconcile it with the 29th Article. But it is qualified by the words, "after an immaterial and spiritual manner," and the author, when he is brought into

court on a charge of heresy, is, I conceive, entitled to the full benefit of this addition. If it renders the proposition ambiguous, contradictory, and unmeaning, this, which would be a ground for censure in another point of view, is just that which may be fairly allowed to protect the author from the legal penalties of false teaching. For thus it appears that he holds with the Church, not only that no change takes place by virtue of the consecration in the natural substance of the bread and wine, but also that no other material substance is thereby added to it. What he himself may understand by matter "present in an immaterial manner," a phrase which seems to amount to as much as a present absence, or a presence after an absent manner, or any other contradiction in terms, it would be useless to inquire, as he very prudently abstains from all attempts at defining it, and treats the presence of which he speaks as an ineffable mystery. In fact he asserts nothing as to the mode in which the sacramental Body and Blood differ from the unconsecrated bread and wine, except that it is immaterial and spiritual. And this is a description quite consistent with the notion of a merely relative change: that is, one by which the elements have become an instrument for conveying that blessing of which the worthy receivers alone partake. A self-contradictory proposition is in itself a mere nullity, and it seems arbitrary and unfair to select a part of it for condemnation, and to ignore another part which neutralizes the offensive meaning. If either is to be taken apart from the other, it should—in a Court of Discipline—be that which bears an orthodox or innocent sense.

A somewhat more intricate question arises on the other proposition condemned by the Court, in which it is affirmed that "worship is due to the real, though invisible and supernatural, presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the holy Eucharist under the form of bread and wine." There can be no doubt that the terms of this proposition have been selected, whether studiously or unconsciously, so as to exhibit the closest approximation to Romish doctrine. For they are the very terms which might be used by a Romanist divine to express the practical inference to which he is led by his tenet of Transubstantiation:

Approximation to Romish doctrine.

the adoration of the Sacrament. The "form of bread and wine" is that which he believes to remain in the consecrated elements after the substance has been withdrawn, and the Body and Blood of Christ have been substituted for it.* But the question is not now as to the judgment shown in the selection of the terms, but as to their meaning in the defendant's proposition, and this can only be determined by reference to the other parts of his own teaching, not to a system which he professes to reject. And when all is taken together, it is not very easy to ascertain what is the object to which he conceives worship to be due.

Nominally it is the Body and Blood of Christ. But by this he cannot be understood to mean any material substance superadded to the bread and wine. For this is, as we have seen, expressly excluded by the term "immaterial" in his other proposition. Nor can he be supposed to claim adoration for anything pertaining only to Christ's human nature, and separate from his Divinity. For this would be manifest idolatry, from which the Romanist guards himself by his doctrine of concomitance, and which ought not to be imputed to any one by whom it has not been distinctly avowed. It would seem therefore that the presence meant can be no other than a purely spiritual presence of Christ Himself, in the entireness of his person, which is, no doubt, in itself a fit object of worship. † And such a presence in the Eucharist, has been constantly affirmed by our most eminent divines, and, as far as I know, denied by none.

Local limitation of the Presence.

It may however be contended, that even when this is assumed to be the author's meaning, he still remains exposed to the charge of a very serious error, by the local limits which he appears to assign to this presence, when he describes it as "under the form of bread and wine," though it must be

* Lombard, iv. Di. 8. "De Sacramento et re. Sacramentum est invisibilis gratiæ visibilis forma. Forma ergo panis et vini, quæ ibi videtur, est sacramentum, id est, signum sacræ rei; quia præter speciem quam ingerit sensibus, aliquid aliud facit in cogitationem venire. Tenent ergo species vocabula rerum quæ ante fuerunt, scilicet panis et vini."

† Whether it ought to be adored in the Eucharist, is quite a different question, which is ably discussed by Mr. Freeman, "Principles of Divine Service," Introd. to Part II. sect. xiii.

observed that the phrase does not necessarily imply a local circumscription.* But this expression is connected with the construction which he puts upon the language of the Catechism, in its general description of a sacrament, as consisting of two parts, "The outward visible sign, and the inward spiritual grace." From this he infers that the outward part and the inward part make up one indivisible whole, not merely as correlative notions, in which sense it is undoubtedly true that a sign implies a thing signified, but actually, so that the outward part cannot exist without the inward part; and consequently that in the Eucharist the inward part or thing signified, which is the Body and Blood of Christ, is so inseparably united with the outward part or sign, the bread and wine, that this cannot be received without the other; and, therefore, that worthy and unworthy receivers alike partake of both.

Erroneous interpretation of Catechism.

It is indeed saddening and humiliating to think that such an interpretation of the Catechism should not only have been adopted by a person filling a high position in our Church, but should have been taken by him as a main groundwork of his system. I should not perhaps be speaking too strongly, if I said that it is a gross and childish mistake, which could only have been suggested by the ambiguity of the word Sacrament, which is sometimes used for the Sacramental symbol, and sometimes for the Sacramental rite. The former is the proper, the latter the derivative sense. When it is asked, "How many Sacraments has Christ ordained in his Church?" the question, of course, relates to the rite. When the meaning of the word Sacrament is to be explained, the answer shews that the symbol alone can be meant. When again it is asked, "How many parts are there in a Sacrament?" the subsequent applications of the answer to Baptism, and the Supper of the Lord, shew, beyond all possibility of doubt, that the question refers to the

Definition of the word Sacrament.

* Local circumscription ("circumscriptio" or "inclusio localis") is expressly denied by all the Lutheran divines. See Chemnitz, Fundamenta S.S. Cœnæ, c. iii.: "Nec quæstio est de locali inclusione corporis Christi in pane;" and Calov., cited by Kahnis, "Die Lehre vom Abendmahle," p. 459, and Schmid, "Die Dogmatik der Evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche," p. 445.

Sacramental rite; and therefore that the enumeration of the parts which properly belong to the rite, can prove nothing whatever as to the actual connexion between the sign and the thing signified, especially in such a sense as would imply that the thing signified is contained in the sign. But we are not now concerned with the correctness of the author's reasoning, but with the import of his proposition. And the question is, What is that which he holds to be present in the Eucharist, under the form of bread and wine, and to which he asserts worship to be due? If it is Christ Himself, the error would lie, not in the worship claimed for Him, not in the assertion of his spiritual presence in the Eucharist, but in that definition of this presence which seems so to annex it to the consecrated bread and wine, that whoever receives them, receives Christ. This, no doubt, is a proposition, than which it is difficult to conceive one either more absurd and shocking in itself, or more directly repugnant to the doctrine of the Church of England. But for this very reason we should be the more loath to fasten it on any one who disclaims it. And though the defendant "holds and teaches, that the Body and Blood of Christ, the inward part or thing signified of the blessed Sacrament, is given to, and is received, unto condemnation, by the unbelieving communicant," he, in the same breath, declares that he fully and heartily accepts the statement of the 29th Article, that "the wicked, and such as be void of a lively faith, in no wise are partakers of Christ."

Propositions irreconcilable.

I do not pretend to be able to reconcile these propositions with one another, or the former, taken by itself, with the teaching of the Articles or the Catechism. But as that which is orthodox is likewise perfectly clear, while that which seems to contradict it is so obscure and ambiguous, that it is very doubtful whether it has any meaning at all, there can be no doubt which of the two we are bound to prefer, when civil rights are at stake, as the true exponent of the author's belief. If the charge had involved no penal consequences, had been brought before the bar of public opinion, and had only affected the author's reputation as a Divine, I have already said

enough to intimate what my judgment would have been. The grounds on which alone it seems possible to acquit him of the legal offence, with which he has been charged,* would, in the other point of view, constitute a very grave inculpation. It is something worse than trifling in one who is pledged to the formularies of our Church, to use language which not only suggests, but is the very technical expression of a Romish error, which he nevertheless professes to reject. And it matters little whether he is unable or unwilling to express his ideas otherwise. Some other dignitary of our Church may avow his belief in the Immaculate Conception, and, on the authority of such quotations as are to be found in the Pope's Bull, may maintain it to be primitive and catholic doctrine, and therefore the doctrine of the Church of England. And it is probable that he might hold and teach it with legal impunity, if he will at the same time declare that he fully and heartily accepts the 9th and 15th Articles. But he would certainly lay himself open to severe censure, which would not be mitigated by any attempt that he might make to reconcile those Articles with the new Romish doctrine. The violence with which the language of the Church has been recently wrested to a like purpose, is one of the most painful features in the controversy we have been reviewing. But still it appears to me that the law would be made an instrument of something very like persecution, if a clergyman was to be deprived of his preferment for contradicting the Articles, though he professed, apparently with perfect sincerity, that he holds every doctrine contained in them, because his interpretation is deemed by some strained and erroneous. And I should not be the more reconciled

Mischief of ambiguous language.

* Whether the Act of the 13 Elizabeth, c. 12, is applicable to the 29th Article, is quite a distinct question, which has been ably discussed in "An Essay on the History of Article XXIX.," by C. A. Swainson, M.A. But Mr. Swainson appears to me to have entirely missed the point of the controversy, when, at p. 56, he states it thus: "It is essential to his view of the Presence in the Eucharist, that the unworthy comer shall *receive* the Body of Christ; it is not essential that he shall *eat* it. The Archdeacon *must hold* that the Presence is removed before the Sacrament is eaten: he denies that it is removed before it is given, before it is received." I am afraid the Archdeacon would not admit that he is bound by this conclusion. He maintains an indiscriminate oral manducation, and only confines the *spiritual* eating to the worthy receiver.

to such an abuse of the law, because it had been provoked by dogmatical intolerance, indicating a like inquisitorial spirit, on the part of the sufferer. I should only lament that a bad example had been followed, instead of being shunned. An inquisitor becomes doubly mischievous when he is exalted into a martyr to the cause of religious liberty, and appears as an advocate of free discussion. I am against oppression and injustice, on whatever side they are found; but, as they are the natural allies of error, I deprecate them most of all when they are called in as auxiliaries to the side of truth.

Reasons for deploring an appeal to law.

And I am bound to add that, under the present circumstances of the Church, an appeal to a judicial tribunal for such a purpose is the more to be deplored, and the less justifiable, because it can lead to no decision which can serve any other end than that of inflicting injury or annoyance on an individual, and must leave the doctrinal question just where it was before. The "exposition" of the 28th and 29th Articles, delivered by the Court at Bath, however "true and legal" it may be, and however respectable the authority from which it proceeds, has not the slightest claim to bind the conscience of any member or minister of our Church, any more than one given by a private theologian; and it seems to assume an exclusive authenticity, to which it has no legitimate title, when it is styled "*the* true and legal exposition," as if every other must be false and illegal.

But there is still another topic connected with this controversy to which I must briefly advert before I quit the subject. The author whose teaching has been condemned would fain represent himself as having been called in question touching the doctrine of the Real Presence, and as opposed to those who either deny it altogether, or acknowledge it in an incomplete or erroneous sense; and he pleads this latitude of opinion, which has been allowed, as he thinks, to other ministers of the Church of England, as a ground for claiming the liberty of maintaining his own view "as the one truth of the doctrine."* It would not seem to follow

* Preface to Sermon III., on the Real Presence, p. 153. Compare the remarks of

that, because there is a variety of opinions consistent with the doctrine of the Church, an opinion which differs from all of them must be so too. But it is important to consider how far the doctrine of the Real Presence is involved in this dispute.

The phrase *Real Presence* is foreign to the language of the Church of England, and has been wisely avoided as liable to abuse, and likely to deceive or scandalize the simple and ignorant. No minister of our Church is required formally to assert or deny the doctrine of the Real Presence. But there is a sense in which it may be and constantly has been asserted in perfect consistency with her authentic teaching, and in which it could not be denied without great detriment to the truth. And this sense is in perfect accordance with the language of Scripture, and especially with that of our Lord Himself, both on other occasions and on that which is recorded in the sixth chapter of St. John, when He was speaking, as some have thought, with direct reference, as almost all admit, in a manner applicable to the Eucharist. When He says, "I am the vine," it may be enough to say that He speaks figuratively. But when He says, "I am the *true* vine," this would be hardly a correct, certainly not an adequate explanation of His meaning. It is not simply as much as to say, "I am like the vine," but, "I am in truth, reality, and effect, that of which the natural vine is only a figure and a shadow. For, by the natural union between the stock and the branches, it represents that far higher and more intimate union which subsists between me and my faithful people." Thus, in this instance, *true* or *real* is contradistinguished from *natural*. So, "My Father giveth you the *true* bread from heaven;" that of which the manna was but a sign: not natural, but spiritual food. So again: "My flesh is meat *indeed*, and my blood is drink *indeed*." It would not be so, if it was fitted to nourish the body, as natural meat and drink. It is so, because it is nourishment for the soul, spiritual meat and drink. And according to the same analogy, the Catechism teaches

The phrase Real Presence.

Real contradistinguished from *natural*.

Chancellor Martin, at p. 8 of his Preface to his very useful "Extracts from eminent Anglican Divines, on the Real Presence in the Eucharist."

that "the Body and Blood of Christ are *verily and indeed* taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper:" that is, not figuratively and unsubstantially, as would be the case if they could be received by the mouth, but really and effectually, so as to impart a solid benefit to the soul. And it is in this sense that so many of our most eminent divines have asserted the *real* presence of Christ's Body, and Blood in the Eucharist: *real*, as possessing a spiritual, life-giving power, for the strengthening and refreshing of the soul, which could not belong to the natural Body and Blood, considered apart from the whole person of Christ. It would be at variance with this analogy, to speak of a *real presence* of any thing merely natural or neutral, and capable of being received unto condemnation. A thing of this kind would want some other real presence to make it effectual for the desired end. As an instrument of a Divine power, the consecrated bread and wine, though utterly powerless in themselves, are quite adequate to the purpose, and cannot require the addition either of any other substance, or even of any mysterious supernatural virtue. And it is no slight objection to the supposition of such an adjunct, that a stupendous miracle would be wrought without any assignable object. Where there is such a real presence, nothing more can be needed to ensure the fulness of the blessing which the Sacrament was designed to convey to all who worthily partake of it. And without such a presence, no preparation could be of any avail. This is a presence which is independent of nearness or distance, and belongs perhaps more properly to time than to space. But with respect to both, we may say that Christ is really present in the Eucharist, that is, in the celebration of the Lord's Supper. And as the consecrated elements are the instrument by which this presence operates in the worthy receiver, it might have been said—innocently, though not wisely—that He is present *under the form of the bread and wine;* and the phrase has been allowed to remain in a notice at the end of the first Book of Homilies. But it cannot now be used either wisely or innocently by a divine of the Church of England, because it is a phrase which must scandalize or mislead, until it is explained; and, when

explained according to her doctrine, is found to signify something which would have been more properly expressed in different words.

Such a presence is, in the highest sense of the word, to the full as *real* as that which, in the Romish and Lutheran systems, and apparently according to the view of the author whose propositions have been recently condemned, is held to be lodged in the sacramental symbols, though not so as to render them the more certainly effective for any beneficial operation. It is therefore a mere polemical artifice to allege that one who rejects all those systems is opposed to the doctrine of a real presence in the Eucharist; and I do not know that there is any other ground for the assertion, that there are ministers of our Church who deny it altogether. But I am not sure that all pay sufficient attention, or attach due importance to this part of the truth. And it would not be surprising if many, recoiling with just aversion from the innovations which have been lately attempted in the language, if not in the essential doctrines of the Church on this head, should have fallen into the opposite extreme, and have lost sight of what I will venture to call the objective reality in the Sacrament. It may be that they hold rightly, that the simple sign is sufficient as the divinely appointed instrument, and a suitable frame of mind in the receiver as the requisite condition, of the benefit to be conveyed; but that they are apt to overlook the necessity for something beside the instrument and the condition, which is more indispensable than either; namely, the Presence, the Power, the spiritual agency, by which the instrument is effectually applied. The practical tendency of this oversight is, to rob the Sacrament of its specific character, to reduce it to a mere form of prayer or mode of preaching; virtually to contradict the teaching of the Church in her Articles, and to divest the language of her Liturgy of all its propriety and significance. It is true that all sacred ordinances have a common end, and that the efficacy of all depends on their common author. But it does not follow that all are of equal dignity or value.

Reality of the presence.

May possibly be overlooked.

Tendency of this oversight.

And if there is a point on which the witness of Scripture, of the purest ecclesiastical tradition, and of our own Church, is more express and uniform than another, it is the peculiar and transcendent quality of the blessing which this Sacrament both represents and exhibits, and consequently of the Presence by which that blessing is conferred. How this Presence differs from that of which we are assured by our Lord's promise, where two or three are gathered together in His name—whether only in degree or in kind—it is beyond the power of human language to define, and of human thought to conceive. It is a subject fit, not for curious speculation, but for the exercise of pious meditation and devotional feeling; and it is one in which there is no danger of ever going beyond the mark, but rather a certainty that the highest flight of contemplation will always fall short of the Divine reality.

Bodily and spiritual food contrasted.

It is our happiness that the bread which nourishes our bodies, is not the less nutritive to any of us, because he knows nothing either of the processes, natural and artificial, by which it is prepared, or of those by which it is digested and assimilated to the texture of his bodily frame. And we do not withhold it from the hungry, until we have either ascertained their knowledge, or enlightened their ignorance on these points. It is to be lamented, that the case is often far otherwise with regard to our spiritual food: that we suffer ourselves to be diverted from its proper use, by speculations on its nature, and on the mode of its operation, and that we are ready to exclude those who differ from us on such questions from the Table of our common Lord.

The topic on which I have been dwelling is so intimately connected with one which has lately occupied a considerable share of public attention, and has excited much warmth of feeling, that I cannot forbear touching upon it; the rather as it affords another illustration of the spirit to which I adverted at the outset. The points of difference between the Communion Office proper to the Scottish Episcopal Church, and our own, have been urged as reasons for regarding all

English and Scotch Communion Offices.

who prefer the former with suspicion, and for excluding them from privileges to which they might otherwise have seemed to be fairly entitled. I cannot say that I am at all surprised at the jealousy which has been displayed with regard to those points, but I am convinced not only that it is not justified by the contents of the Scottish Office, but that it was not in fact suggested by them, but, having arisen from other causes, has happened to fall upon it. There is indeed a very considerable difference between the two Offices, both in their structure and their language. But this I cannot consider as an evil in itself, still less as anything which ought to be a bar to the freest brotherly intercourse between two Churches which so closely agree with one another in doctrine and discipline. Liturgical uniformity is no doubt very desirable within the pale of each Church, though even there it may be too rigidly enforced, or carried too far into details which it would be better to leave to the choice of the several congregations. But in the case of two independent Protestant Churches, a far greater latitude may be perfectly consistent with their essential unity and concord, and may even yield some benefit, especially with regard to that rite which presents such a variety of aspects, that they can hardly be all fully brought out by any human composition. And it is by no means certain that, where the Scottish Communion Office differs from the English, the advantage is always on our side. There are passages in the Scottish Office, which, as it appears to me, add much to its solemnity, without being liable to any misconstruction in point of doctrine. They express that, which in the English Office is tacitly implied, but is left to be understood, and therefore may easily be overlooked. But the main difference between the two Offices consists in the greater prominence which is given in the Scottish to the commemorative character of the rite. This is indicated, partly by the language used in the form of Consecration, which dwells much more emphatically than our own on the Memorial, and partly by the number of prayers and other acts of devotion which are interposed between the Consecration and the Com-

Principal difference between the two Offices.

munion, while in our Office the one follows immediately after the other. This portion of the Scotch service includes the Prayer for the Church militant, the Lord's Prayer, Invitation to the Holy Communion, the General Confession, and Absolution, the hortative sentences of Scripture, and the Prayer for a meet and salutary reception of the consecrated elements. It is clear that in the view of the framers of this Liturgy, the interval between consecration and communion is the most appropriate season for all manner of supplications general and special, which are founded upon the great sacrifice commemorated in the Eucharist. I must own that I do not see any valid doctrinal objection to this view, though I am aware that it may be carried out in a manner liable to great abuse. The structure of the English Office is grounded upon a different, but not a conflicting view of the subject; and it possesses two important practical advantages. One is, that it embodies the truth, which seems to be so clearly signified by the terms of the original institution, that the reception of the Sacrament is an integral part of the divinely appointed memorial. The other is, that it precludes, as far as possible, all danger of a very serious error, that is, of confounding the eucharistic sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving with the one Oblation once offered, which it commemorates; in other words, that it leaves no room for any approach to the Romish false doctrine of a propitiatory sacrifice in the Eucharist. I think that at the present juncture it would be difficult to overrate the value of these advantages, and that we cannot be too thankful for a Liturgy which bears such clear and decided witness to a main Article of our Protestant faith. But, at the same time, it would, in my opinion, be very unjust to charge the framers of the Scotch Office, or those who make use of it, with the intention either of questioning the truth, or sanctioning the error to which I have just adverted.

Bishop Horsley's opinion of the Scotch Office.

An eminent divine of our Church, one of the most learned of my predecessors in this see, Bishop Horsley, did not hesitate to declare that he "thought the Scotch Office more conformable to the primitive models, and in his private judgment more edifying, than that which we now use." And he ex-

pressed his belief that "our form of consecration of the elements is sufficient," in a way which clearly intimates his opinion, that it is not more than sufficient, and might have been much more satisfactory. The supposed defect to which he alludes has been noticed by many others, divines of unquestioned orthodoxy, some of whom have thought it desirable to supply it in manuals of private devotion. It consists in the omission of the Prayer of Invocation, which in the primitive Church appears to have been regarded as no less essential to the form of consecration than the narrative which recites the words of institution.* And it can hardly be denied, that our ritual would lie open to the charge of deviating in an important particular from our Lord's example, and from apostolic usage, as recorded in Scripture, if there was nothing in it to represent that giving of thanks or blessing, by which we find the bread and the cup to have been constantly hallowed before the distribution. But it should be remembered that we know absolutely nothing as to the mode or the terms in which this was done by our Lord or his Apostles; and that, whatever may be the imperfection of our form of consecration, though the recital, which contains the groundwork of the whole ordinance, is treated as the most essential part, still it is in substance and effect a prayer for the same blessing which is implored more formally and expressly in the Scotch form, and that it is preceded by a most solemn ascription of thanks and praise. I cannot therefore subscribe to the opinion, that there is even an apparent material defect in this part of our Office, however I may sympathize with the regret which has been

* See Bishop Russell (of Glasgow), Charge, 1845, p. 35. "Most of us agree in the opinion so well expressed by Bishop Horsley, that the holy Sacrament is regularly administered by the common Office, though the doctrine of the Church is not distinctly brought out. By the ignorant and dishonest, the Scottish is said to approach nearer than the other to the canon of the mass. Never was there a greater mistake; for while a Roman Catholic might receive the Sacrament according to the English form, he could not possibly receive it according to the Scottish. In this last, the prayer of invocation is held indispensable, a prayer which an intelligent member of the Church of Rome could not tolerate, because it would imply that the bread and wine, after being transubstantiated, made the very Body and Blood of our Lord, required to be blessed and sanctified." With this may be compared Bishop Mant's "Letter on the Scotch Communion Office," and "A Letter to Bishop Skinner," by the Rev. John Alexander.

so frequently expressed, that it does not include a more distinct and explicit petition for the Divine blessing on the elements. It is quite another question whether the language of the Scotch prayer may not be open to reasonable objection. And I think it can hardly be denied that it is not free from ambiguity; and that although its meaning may be perfectly consistent with sound doctrine, that meaning might have been more clearly expressed, so as to avoid the danger of even remotely suggesting the error of the corporal presence. This object seems to me to have been best accomplished in the American Liturgy, which retains the Invocation in a form which is effectually guarded against any such misconception. But the same object is also attained in the first Liturgy of Edward VI., by the insertion of two words, which suggest the distinction between the instrument, the material elements, and the spiritual blessing, which it is designed to convey to the worthy receiver. And it is solely in the omission of these two words, or the substitution of the word "become" for "be unto us," that the Scotch Prayer of Invocation differs from that of the above-mentioned Liturgy. It may be true, that this omission does not necessarily affect the sense; that the context may still bear an orthodox construction; the change indicated by the word "become" be merely relative or sacramental; and, therefore, that the omission may be defended on the ground that "the phrases are," as has been said, "equal in value, theologically and grammatically."* But if the question was to be argued on the ground of Christian prudence and charity, I think that the difference would not appear so unimportant, and that when one of the phrases is unequivocal, and capable of none but an orthodox sense, while the other is liable to a misconstruction, which may offend or mislead, it cannot be doubted which of the two ought to be preferred. And under certain circumstances, the deliberate retention of a phrase which was originally harmless, may assume the character of an act, intended to maintain the doctrine which the phrase has been supposed to imply.† For there seems to be

Its language not free from ambiguity.

* Bishop Russell, Charge, 1845, note iv. p. 42.

† By persons however who are perhaps not aware that the expression which they

hardly any other motive than the assertion of that which is considered as an important truth, that could justify the refusal of such an easy satisfaction to doubting minds and tender consciences, as the insertion, or rather the restoration, of two words in a prayer. But with these qualifications, I cannot wonder, much less regard it as ground for censure or suspicion, that members of the Scotch Episcopal Church should be warmly attached to their own peculiar Liturgy; and I think it neither liberal nor reasonable, that they should be required to surrender it as the price of any advantage which they might derive from a closer outward communion with the Church of England.

Relation of the controversy to that on Baptism.

The controversy on the Eucharist has followed that which agitated the Church on the Sacrament of Baptism, not simply in order of time, but in the relation of an effect to its cause. It was almost avowedly a counter-movement of a party which resented an advantage that had been gained by its antagonists, and desired to counterbalance it by an equivalent success. One had made good the right of holding an opinion which some wished to have condemned as heretical on the efficacy of Baptism; another therefore would claim the like liberty of teaching what was considered on the opposite side as a pernicious heresy on the nature of the Eucharist. But unhappily—as indeed it was but too easy to foresee—the later controversy, though it has in some measure superseded the earlier one in the hold which it took on public attention, has made no change in the relative position or views of the parties, unless so far as it has served to embitter the spirit of their contest, and to render it more exclusive and intolerant. Those who had successfully maintained their ground when it was legally threatened, have not been content with this victory, but have been animated by it with the hope of becoming sole masters of the field. A movement appears to have been set on foot for effecting this object by means of what is called a *purification* of the Liturgy, which has been lately recommended

Proposed Purification of the Liturgy.

prefer is that of the Canon of the Mass, where the words of the prayer before the consecration are, "Ut NOBIS corpus et sanguis fiat dilectissimi filii tui."

in an elaborate work,* written with considerable ability, but not so remarkable on this account, as because there is reason to believe that it represents the views of an active party, which is bent on accomplishing a radical change in the character of the Church. I am not aware that these views had been ever in our day so clearly expressed or so openly avowed. It is, as far as I know, the first time in our memory that a revision of the Liturgy has been proposed, or rather demanded, for the express purpose of adapting it to a peculiar system of doctrine, for which its partisans had hitherto been satisfied with the shelter which it found in the language of our present formularies. And in this point of view the attempt may be regarded as perhaps the most glaring example that has occurred in our own Church of that dogmatical intolerance to which I have been directing your attention. The pretext for this attempt has been furnished by a polemical artifice which is very common, though not on that account the more creditable, by which the disputant first affixes his own definition to an ambiguous term, and then charges his opponents with the worst consequences which he can deduce from the meaning which he imputes to them. The author's historical review of the various phases through which our Liturgy, and other Formularies, have passed, before they were brought to their present shape, will perhaps, so far as it is correct, lead others to a very different conclusion, and will inspire a feeling of gratitude for the result which has been worked out through this long conflict of jarring opinions, prejudices, and passions, together with a resolution not to throw away that which has been thus providentially preserved. Of the consequences that would probably ensue from the success of this attempt to the peace and welfare of the Church, I need not speak, as I believe the danger of such an event to be very remote, and I have only adverted to it as an illustration of an evil which is manifesting itself among us in a great variety of forms. The most mischievous effect that there seems room to apprehend from the attempt itself,

Pretext for it.

* "Liturgical Purity, our Rightful Inheritance." By John C. Fisher, M.A., of the Middle Temple.

is the prejudice which it may raise against all proposals for Liturgical changes, though conceived in a widely different spirit, and directed to a wholly distinct object. I trust however that it will only serve as a salutary warning against the principle which it so boldly avows, and will not deter the more liberal and enlightened friends of the Church from persevering in their endeavours to bring about such modifications of her Liturgical usages, as may adapt them to the altered circumstances and growing needs of our times. It would indeed be surprising if, while all around us has been undergoing such vast and momentous changes, the regulations of public worship continued to be as well suited as ever to their original purposes, and if no inconvenience could now arise from an Act of Uniformity, always of questionable expediency, and passed two centuries ago. There is a strong conviction in many minds, one which has of late been fast gaining ground, and is making itself more and more distinctly audible, that such a supposition would be no less contrary to fact than to antecedent probability, and that it is highly desirable to provide a remedy for the inconvenience which has arisen from the existing incongruity between the state of the law and the wants of the Church.* But the most important among the objects which such friends of the Church have in view, might be accomplished without any change in the language of our Formularies, simply by enlarged facilities for a freer use of the contents of the Prayer Book and the Bible. Out of this treasure might be brought "things new and old," which, by means of a judicious selection and arrangement, would amply suffice for the ordinary use of the household of faith. This therefore would seem to be the object which should take precedence of all others in every plan for the improvement of the Liturgy. It would be effected mainly by some slight alterations in the Rubric and the Calendar. But after this had been done, there would still remain some deficiencies to be supplied, and there might be yet room for a farther revision, which would

If attempted, would prevent beneficial changes.

Objects and method of Liturgical Revision.

* See "The People's Call for a Revision of the Liturgy, in a Letter to Lord Palmerston," by the Rev. James Hildyard, 1857.

contribute, though in an inferior degree, to the usefulness of the materials already at our disposal. It might be desirable to provide a greater number of Services for special occasions of regular and frequent occurrence, as well as a greater variety of extraordinary Prayers and Thanksgivings. It would then be time to consider, whether the language of the Prayer Book required or admitted of improvement for purposes as to which, in principle, all would agree, however they might differ from one another in the details of its practical application. For in the abstract none would deny the expediency of removing all needless occasions of offence or mistake arising from an obsolete or ambiguous phraseology.

Services for special occasions.

This subject has already engaged the attention of the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury, chiefly in connection with the larger question of a better provision for the spiritual wants of our growing population: and that Convocation has been praised by the author, to whose work I have been referring, for the readiness which it has shewn to address itself to this subject, and the desire it has manifested for a revision of the Prayer Book.* But I believe that, if there was a principle on which the Convocation was more unanimous than any other, it was that the first, the indispensable condition on which any such proposals for Liturgical changes could be entertained, was the strictest abstinence from all attempt at dogmatical innovation, and that even the remotest suspicion of an intention to *purify* the Liturgy in the author's sense, would in their judgment have been fatal to any plan by which such an intention was betrayed. But, however little that praise was merited by any apparent conformity to the author's views on the point to which he attaches supreme importance, it is, as coming from such a quarter, highly significant and worthy of notice. It marks a great change in public opinion with regard to Convocation. When I last addressed you, I felt it necessary to point out the groundlessness of any alarm about the mode in which Convocation might exercise whatever powers it possesses, even

Change in opinion respecting Convocation.

* See p. 572 and foll.

though unrestricted as to the time allowed for its deliberations. It then seemed to me not superfluous to observe: "Not only has it no independent legislative authority, by which it could encroach upon existing rights, or introduce perilous innovations, but it is liable at any moment to be reduced to silence and inaction." The apprehensions which this remark was designed to allay, had been alleged, in the same quarter from which Convocation has been just receiving this tribute of praise, as a ground for stifling the first signs of its returning life, and keeping it in perpetual silence and inaction. *Now* it is applauded by one who puts himself in the van of those who were its most violent opponents, because he thinks it is, or hopes it may become, favourable to an encroachment on existing rights, which it deems most sacred, and may serve to introduce innovations which it regards as both perilous and unjustifiable. But now that the fears which were at first held out as reasons for silencing Convocation, have been too generally recognized as idle and visionary, to be any longer available for such a purpose, its adversaries have shifted their ground, and endeavour to represent its proceedings as a mere waste of time, because they have not been attended with any immediate palpable results in a legislative form. As however there would be some difficulty in urging this as a reason for suppressing those proceedings, the fact that this is the strongest objection that is any longer alleged against them, may be considered as affording some security that they will not in future be forcibly interrupted, or compressed within narrower limits. Persons however who watch them with a friendly and enlightened interest, believe that they no more deserve to be denounced as useless, than as dangerous. To such observers they appear to be a necessary preparation for a most important work, in which the welfare of the Church is far more deeply concerned than in any particular legislative enactment: and such persons would regard any attempt at ecclesiastical legislation, even if it were practicable under present circumstances, as premature and mischievous. But they see room to hope, that out of these consultations, without any direct appeal to secular authority, there may

grow that which in time, with God's blessing, may renew the face of the Church, and infuse the vigour of a second youth into all parts of her system. Consider for a moment what we have, and what we want. There is no lack of energy, or of wisdom, or of zeal, or devotedness, though all no doubt capable of increase, in the Church, either among the Clergy or the Laity: there is a superabundance of material wealth in their public and private property; there are manifold advantages attached to their legal and social position. What is wanted is that these various resources should be drawn forth, combined, and applied for a common end. But it is clear, that union of will must precede and prepare the way for unity of action, and such union can only be elicited and expressed by means of conference and free discussion. But it is evident that Convocation, as it is at present constituted, is utterly inadequate to such a purpose; and it is more than doubtful, it is altogether improbable, that its constitution will ever be so modified as to render it a fit instrument for so great a work. It may however be found,—and the thought appears to be growing more and more familiar to those who have most carefully considered the subject,—that Convocation, however useful in its measure, is very far from exhausting the Church's legal capacity for united deliberation on her own concerns; and that a mode might be devised, in perfect harmony with her ancient institutions, for gathering the sense both of the Clergy and the Laity on questions affecting their common interests and objects, as faithful members of her communion.* No doubt many difficulties will have to be overcome, before any such plan can be matured and carried into effect. It will probably be fashioned only by degrees, with the aid of experience, and arrive at whatever success it may attain through many failures and disappointments. But it should be observed, that it will not have to contend—as would be the case with any attempt at a re-construction of Convocation—with difficulties depending on the will of any who are foreign or hostile to the Church, but only with such

Convocation cannot effect what is wanted.

* See "Convocation and the Laity; a Letter to Archdeacon Grant," by Francis Henry Dickinson, Esq.

as may arise from a divergency of views and opinions on secondary points, among those who are perfectly unanimous on the main object, and equally desirous of promoting her interests. It is true that such a representation of the Church, however complete, would be even less capable than Convocation now is of any action that would possess legal force, or exert any other than a purely moral influence. But the weight which its deliberations would carry with them would be in proportion to the completeness of its organization, and its moral influence would probably make itself felt in quarters where the judgment and wishes of Convocation could command no respect or sympathy. The relation in which Convocation would stand to such a representative body, would determine itself according to circumstances which cannot be exactly calculated. But there would be nothing in the new institution either to change the legal character, or to supersede the ordinary functions, of the ancient ecclesiastical synod. In the meanwhile the recent sessions of Convocation have served the important purpose of satisfying every impartial mind, that our party divisions would not be likely to raise any formidable obstacle to the success of such an attempt as I have been indicating, but rather that, in proportion as the basis of the representation is enlarged, prudence and moderation may be expected to preside over the counsels of the Church, and there will be the less danger from the spirit of intolerance and persecution in any direction.

Clerical influence on the Legislature.

The influence which may be exerted on the Legislature by an expression of the opinions and feelings of any large portion of the Clergy, has been recently illustrated by the important concession which has been made to the conscientious scruples entertained by many of them, with regard to the celebration of marriage in cases where the former marriage of one of the parties had been dissolved on the ground of adultery. I wish that this concession, valuable as it is, had been more ample, and had fully met the scruples of those clergymen who, on grounds which are entitled to the highest respect, even from those who do not entirely assent to them, believe marriage to be absolutely

indissoluble. The more extensively this conviction prevails among the Clergy, the stronger must be its claim on the forbearance of the Legislature. And if it was shared by comparatively few, the danger of inconvenience to individuals seeking for the solemnization of their union under such circumstances would be proportionately less. I abstain from all discussion of the question itself. Independently of all religious scruples, I cannot help viewing the new facilities given to divorce with strong misgiving; but only because I fear that they may operate injuriously on the domestic interests of society, not because I think that the Legislature has, in this innovation, exceeded its rightful powers, and violated the law of God. I am indeed persuaded that, in a community like the primitive Church, regulated by the pure mind and will of Christ, marriage would invariably be held indissoluble. But I am not equally satisfied that all the precepts which would be binding on such a community, are likewise applicable to one placed in circumstances so widely different as those of our age and nation, or were intended to be universally enforced by legislative authority. I am afraid that, whatever *hardness of heart* warranted a relaxation of their rigour under the Mosaic dispensation, may be found in an equal degree in modern English society: and the question how it may be best treated is one of prudence rather than of principle. But it seems to me clear, that, however this may be, the Legislature cannot reasonably or consistently require the Clergy, whom it obliges to recognize the Scriptures as of supreme authority, to act in contravention of that which appears to them to be there plainly taught as the commandment of Christ.

Facilities for divorce.

I must now turn to some topics which are more immediately connected with the concerns of our own Diocese. And that which first presents itself is one which I approach with much pain and reluctance. I had for a time indulged the hope, that I might be spared the necessity of thus publicly adverting to it: but even when I was forced to abandon that hope, I found no reason for anticipating this which seems the most convenient season for that purpose. The

Rev. Rowland Williams.

subject was first brought under my notice, in a form which called for a practical decision, in the latter part of last year, by a memorial signed by upwards of seventy beneficed clergymen of the Diocese, in which they drew my attention to a volume of Sermons, published by the Vice-Principal of St. David's College;* 'both with regard to its teaching generally, and especially to its statements on Holy Scriptures,' which appeared to the subscribers 'seriously to affect the supremacy and infallibility of Scripture as the Divine rule of faith and practice, and to clash with the language of the Articles and Prayer Book on the subject.' They declared that these statements had 'filled them with alarm, and shaken their confidence in the author as a theologian,' and expressed their fear that 'his continuance in the office which he holds, would be attended with most serious consequences to the interests of the College and the welfare of the Church in the Principality;' and therefore 'prayed me to adopt such steps as I might deem best calculated to meet the emergency, and to restore confidence in the Divinity instruction, which candidates for the ministry of our Church receive at St. David's College.' Memorial on false doctrine.

The question thus formally raised, had long before engaged my most earnest attention; but the step by which alone it seemed possible that the confidence, which had been in this respect withdrawn from the College, could be effectually restored, was one which, as I explained in my answer to the memorial, it did not rest with me to adopt. But I must now add that, if my power of dealing with this case had been as ample and absolute as it had been assumed to be by persons unacquainted with its real nature and extent, it would not have been easy for me to reconcile that which might appear to be required for the interests of the College, and the peace of the Diocese, with the respect due to the rights of individuals; rights which, when clear, I could not think it lawful to sacrifice to any object, however otherwise desirable. There are two or three general principles Reasons for not acceding to it.

* "Rational Godliness after the Mind of Christ and the written Voices of His Church," by Rowland Williams, B.D.

by which I should wish to be governed, whenever I am called upon to exercise any authority with which I am entrusted for the conservation of sound doctrine. On the one hand, I hold myself bound to resist the introduction of all error contrary to the teaching of the Church: on the other hand, I regard it as a no less sacred and important part of my duty, to respect, and, as far as lies in me, to protect that freedom of thought, word, and action, which the Church has hitherto granted to her ministers and members, and neither to make nor to sanction an attempt to place it under any new restriction which she has not thought fit to impose. I also consider it as a plain rule of equity, that no man shall be held responsible for opinions which he disavows, and that every one shall be allowed to interpret his language in his own sense, and shall not be convicted of heresy—above all when the conviction is to involve penal consequences—on a construction of his words which he does not himself admit.

It was apparently in conformity with this principle, that one who gave instruction in Divinity in the University of Oxford, having published doctrine which seemed to be at variance with the teaching of our Church, was recently required to renew his declaration of belief in her Articles. And it is a fact not without moment, that the sermon which has been considered as especially liable to the charge of false doctrine in the case now before us, was preached before the University of Cambridge, which has since conferred the degree of Doctor of Divinity on the author.

Difficulties involved in the case.

The difficulty to which I alluded, arises partly from the nature of the subject, and partly from the peculiar manner in which the author has treated it. I trust that I shall not be supposed to be speaking disparagingly of his unquestionable ability, if I venture to doubt whether his doctrinal statements would have attracted much attention, if they had not been forced into notice by the accident of his position. It may be that the fault lies with myself: but I must own that they appear to me singularly deficient in clearness and precision. They are commonly forcible and striking; often pregnant and suggestive: not unfrequently epigrammatic and pungent. But these are

qualities which, however attractive, are not always favourable to perspicuity, and, however well suited to the ordinary purposes of a sermon, are not equally so to the treatment of controverted points of dogmatical theology, in which they may leave room painfully to miss that dry, homely, sometimes rather wordy and tedious, but unaffected and unpretending style, to which we are accustomed in the works of English divines, who have handled such subjects, and which, whatever may be its faults, has the merit of conveying, whether in many or few words, neither more nor less than the writer's exact meaning. This deficiency has perhaps operated injuriously on the general impression produced by the work we are now considering, and certainly increases the difficulty of forming a clear judgment upon it.

With regard however to the nature of the questions raised by some portions of it, and to which the memorial expressly refers, there are some distinctions which it is important to keep in view. These questions do not immediately touch any Article of the Christian faith: they relate not to the things themselves "which a Christian ought to know and believe to his soul's health;" but to the mode of the communication through which these truths are known and believed. And it is gratifying to reflect that no complaint has reached me, imputing any unsoundness to the author's teaching on any such points. Still it cannot be denied, that in one point of view the questions which concern the communication of the truth may be considered as more important, and as lying nearer to the foundation of the whole, than any part of the truth itself. For the certainty and value of all parts alike depend on the Divine character of the communication; and if that should be rejected, must be greatly impaired, if not utterly ruined. But then this applies only to the Divine origin of the communication; and when that is admitted, the question as to the mode of transmission, though highly interesting and important, becomes one of secondary moment. To individuals indeed, according to the view which they take of it, it may still appear to be fundamental, as involving the very groundwork of their own private belief. And this is a good reason why they

Distinctions to be kept in view.

should cling firmly to that which is the main stay of all their religious convictions. But it is not a reason why they should attempt to force others to rest their belief on the same ground, still less why they should charge those who take a different view of the subject with unbelief or unsoundness in the faith. One who has been used to regard the authorised translation of the Bible as of equal authority with the original text, will naturally shrink from a proposal to make any change in the sacred words with which his deepest feelings of veneration are inseparably associated by life-long habit. And he would certainly have a right to complain, if any one compelled him to use a new or altered version. But the right would not be on his side, if, not content with opposing those who wish to bring the translation into closer correspondence with the original, he should accuse them of irreverence, or of a design to corrupt and mutilate the Scriptures. Yet I believe this would be neither a purely imaginary, nor an extreme case. An eminent person, whose opinion carries much weight with it in some religious circles, is reported to have expressed himself publicly to the effect, "that it would be far better to plunge at once into infidelity or atheism, than to stand in the position of one who denies the plenary inspiration of Scripture; because this cuts from under us the very ground on which we stand."* As a description of personal experience, such language may not be extravagant; and the state of mind which it indicates, so long as it is kept within its proper bounds, is entitled to the utmost tenderness and sympathy. But when this individual consciousness is set up as the common measure of truth, to which all are required to conform under penalty of exclusion from Christian fellowship, it becomes an instrument of aggression on the rights of conscience, and usurpation of authority which belongs only to the Church.

The Church has not defined Inspiration.

If we refer, as we are bound to do, to the Church's standards of doctrine, we find that she has pronounced no decision, has laid down no definition on this subject. It was indeed hardly possible that she should have done so. For

* See "The Bible and Lord Shaftesbury," by the Rev. Henry Burgess, p. 29.

the whole question as to the nature and extent of the inspiration of Scripture is one of modern, and among ourselves of very recent, origin. And there was nothing in any of the controversies in which she was engaged, to call for or suggest a formal exposition of her views on these points. It was only in her dispute with the Church of Rome that she had occasion to assert the sufficiency of Holy Scripture, as containing all things necessary to salvation, and so to reject the claim of equal dignity which had been advanced in behalf of an unscriptural tradition, and of the decrees, whether of pope or council, as living oracles of Divine truth. In this sense she requires her ministers to acknowledge the supremacy of Scripture. And though she does not expressly speak either of its supremacy or its infallibility, yet that acknowledgment clearly implies a confession of infallibility to the same extent. For it would be mere trifling to assert the sufficiency of Scripture, as containing all things necessary to salvation, unless there was an equally sure warrant for their truth as for their necessity. And in the Second Part of the Exhortation to the Reading of Holy Scripture, we are exhorted to "stay, quiet, and certify our consciences with the most infallible certainty, truth, and perpetual assurance" of "these holy rules, injunctions, and statutes of our Christian religion." But as the Article confines itself to things necessary to salvation, so the Homily grounds its exhortation entirely on such uses of Scripture as are subservient to the same end. But with regard to things which lie outside of this circle, and have no special connexion either with faith or practice,—as in another Homily it is remarked, that "the rehearsal of the genealogies and pedigrees of the fathers is not to much edification of the plain ignorant people,"—the Church has not delivered any dogmatical determination as to the infallibility of Scripture, or the mode by which it was divinely secured. She could have had no inducement to frame an Article for avoiding diversities of opinions on these subjects, unless she had been enabled to foresee the speculations and controversies which were to spring up in later times with respect to them. Some may wish that she had been endued with such prescience; others may think

that it was wisely and graciously withheld. But the fact remains, that she has not bound her ministers by any authoritative statement on these questions, but has left them at liberty to inquire for themselves, and to arrive at such conclusions as best satisfy their own judgments. It would therefore be a waste of time to consider what her decision would probably have been if an occasion had arisen to call for one. To my own mind indeed, independently of historical facts, the whole tenor of the language in which she expresses her profound veneration for Holy Scripture, seems to leave little room for doubt as to which side she would have taken in any controversy which appeared to affect its dignity and authority. But this, however certain it may appear, though it may raise a presumption in favour of that view which she would have preferred, and though it ought especially to protect those who adhere to that view from hard or contemptuous language on the part of their opponents, still cannot be allowed to abridge the right of free investigation which has actually been left to the ministers of the Church in this department of theology.

Freedom of investigation permitted.

Nor ought it to be lightly assumed, that those who, in the exercise of that right, have been led to a different conclusion, one perhaps less in accordance with the mind of the Church at an earlier period, do not fully share that veneration for Holy Scripture which breathes through all her formularies. This freedom has been used by men of whom it is impossible to doubt, that they heartily accepted and reverenced the Scriptures as the Divine Rule of Faith and Practice, and yet conceived their infallibility to be not absolute, but relative. And when the principle is conceded, its application must be left to the discretion of each individual, which cannot be rightfully limited by any authority lower than that of the Church. Those only who are not conversant with the subject, can fail to be aware that it is beset with conflicting difficulties, between which a choice has to be made; and it is an inevitable incident of our nature that these difficulties should be variously estimated by different minds, so that what to one appears the greater, should to another appear the less. And there can hardly be a case in which that intolerant spirit, to which I have

so frequently alluded in this address, shews itself in a more unamiable light, or with more pernicious effects, than when it confounds the advocates with the assailants of Christianity, and not only rejects their services in behalf of the common cause, but charges them with treachery and apostasy, because they would wage the contest on a different ground from that on which it has itself been used to take its stand.

But these general remarks might be in danger of being misapplied, unless I added a few of a more special nature. The author, whose orthodoxy had been impugned on account of his volume of Sermons, resorted in self-defence to a course of proceeding which, as far as regards its avowed object, must be admitted to be fair, manly, and every way worthy of his character and station. "As the most inoffensive mode of correcting some mis-statements about his book, for which," as he says, "he is far from claiming infallibility, but which he wishes to see represented fairly, and discussed calmly," he published his own explanation of its "true meaning" in a series of Propositions. And he has since republished this statement with some slight alterations, and with the addition of a fresh series of propositions, extracted, either verbally or in substance, from his Sermons, and running parallel to a series of counter-propositions which he conceives must, by logical necessity, be adopted by all who reject his.* If this was a case for judgment in a Court of Heresy, perhaps the author might be considered as no longer responsible for any statement in his book which is not repeated in this explanation of its true meaning. But if we are not confined to the strictly legal or technical point of view, but are still at liberty—as the author would undoubtedly admit—to examine the whole work with the aid of those propositions, and are not bound to treat them as a complete substitute for it, then it seems very doubtful whether much has been gained by that explanation, and whether it is well adapted to either of the ends which the author appears to have had in view; that is, "fair representation," and "calm discussion." I am constrained

Explanation given by the author.

* "Lampeter Theology Exemplified in Extracts from the Vice-Principal's Lectures, Letters, and Sermons."

to say that he must have been labouring under a very strange and unhappy delusion, when he imagined that calmness of discussion could be promoted either by the terms which he applies to his opponents, or by the antithesis in which he exhibits their supposed opinions—being the inferences which he draws from their objections to his doctrine—in contrast to his own. I know not how far this asperity may have been provoked by the language of his assailants, but I am sure that it could not tend to allay the heat of controversy, and that it was not better suited to further the interests of truth than those of charity; and I lament that, if he felt himself aggrieved by the manner in which his writings were attacked, he did not rather endeavour to shame his adversaries by the contrast of a milder and more dignified tone.

How far his propositions are explanatory.

But the graver question is, how far these propositions are an adequate representation of the statements which have given most offence in his work, considered as a whole. And I must own that I doubt whether, if they had appeared first, they would have prepared any one for all that was to be found on the same head in the Sermons. I am inclined to think that, if they would then have seemed strange and startling to an intelligent reader, it would have been not so much on account of anything which they distinctly state, as of the difficulty of perceiving their exact drift and their collective import, and because such a reader might conceive a suspicion of something behind them all, which they were meant to suggest, but not to express. It is, as I have observed, characteristic of the author's style, that it is generally apt to make such an impression. But here the effect is produced not merely by the form or wording, but by the substance and nature of the propositions themselves. They look like fragmentary outlines of a system which cannot be fully appreciated, until the parts are put together and viewed as a connected whole. And when such a suspicion is once roused, it will be strengthened by things that would otherwise have served to divert it. The vagueness, the simplicity, the undeniable truth of some of these propositions, will make them appear, not pointless or commonplace, but the more significant and emphatic. And

when it is remembered that they were framed, not as a simple enunciation of doctrine, but for an apologetic controversial purpose, it will be the more difficult to believe that, where their obvious sense is most harmless and self-evident, it does not cover a depth of questionable meaning.

Thus the first proposition consists of three parts. It begins with a definition of Revelation, stating what it is, generally and "especially." "Revelation is an unveiling of the true God, especially as Love and as a Spirit, to the eyes of the mind." When we recollect that the true God is a Spirit, it may seem a little strange to find one of his attributes thus coupled with his essential nature. It will however not be denied that both will be included in every complete, or not materially imperfect revelation of the Godhead. And the definition has the advantage of the greatest possible comprehensiveness in other respects; for it embraces every conceivable process by which our knowledge of the true God, in His nature, His attributes, His works, and His will, may be acquired or enlarged. But this advantage is attended with the inconvenience, that the definition is utterly useless for the purpose for which it might have been supposed to have been designed, that of throwing light on the Author's views of Revelation; for it leaves us wholly uninformed, whether he admits any distinction among those various processes, by virtue of which the name of Revelation would be more properly applied to one than to another. The proposition proceeds to state wherein "much of the evidence of Revelation consists," namely, "in its conformity to whatever is best in the moral nature given, and kept alive in us by our Maker." But here it seems evident, that the author has confounded the object or matter of Revelation with the process, which was the proper subject of the definition; for that conformity to our moral nature must lie in the things revealed, not in the revealing. So that as to the evidence of this, as distinct from the things themselves, the proposition is still altogether silent. It concludes with the inference, that "to vilify mankind overmuch, is not honouring Almighty God so much as degenerating his handiwork, and is

His definition of Revelation.

injurious to religion;" a sentiment which will probably command very general assent, but which may also give occasion for surprise, that so large a basis should have been laid for so slight a superstructure.

Vagueness of his statements.

The absence of any definite statement on the subject of Revelation, in a proposition which professedly treats of it, is the more remarkable, because in the next there is apparently a plain intimation, that in some sense or other Revelation is common to Jews and Gentiles. For "God," it is said, "left Himself no where without witness, but fashioned the hearts of the heathen, and put a Scripture in their conscience." It would therefore have been more satisfactory, if the author had explained, in what respect, according to his view, the Revelation made to the Jews differed from that made to the Gentiles.

His view of Inspiration.

On the kindred subject of Inspiration, the propositions are much more explicit. Many of them are expressly devoted to it, and others bear more or less upon it. In these the author dwells on the distinction between "things of heaven" and "things of earth," facts which could only have been learnt supernaturally, and facts of daily life and experience, as marking a limit which, however difficult it may be to trace, he believes to exist in Scripture, between "the truth of God" and "the thoughts of fallible men." He insists on the presence of a human element in the sacred writings, as constituting a main condition of their power and efficacy, as an instrument for reaching the heart and stirring the affections of men, but at the same time as implying some imperfection of knowledge, and some liability to error, which however in his judgment cannot properly affect the value of Scripture as a book of religion and devotion. And he thinks it necessary to deny that "the Books of the New Testament were *dictated* in words audible from the clouds of heaven," and that "Inspiration, even in its proper sphere"—that is, as concerning things of heaven—"implies omniscience."

So far, however open to controversy these statements may be, there is nothing new or peculiar to the writer in the general principle which they involve. But when he proceeds to explain his

own view of the nature of Inspiration, he diverges much farther from the ideas commonly associated with the term. For he seems to confine the agency of the Holy Spirit as its author, to his sanctifying influence, and to deny that it ever implies any illumination of the mind, which is not the result of that influence on the heart. Undoubtedly the positive side of this proposition cannot be too strongly affirmed; but it ought not to be confounded with the negative side, as it is by the author, when, having most truly observed that "the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom, and a good heart will clear the intellect," he proceeds to say: "Thus, the more spiritual any man's life, the more inspired his writings; and the Apostles who had most of the temper and mind of Christ, were the most eminently inspired." This, if it only means that those of them were the holiest who had most of the temper and mind of Christ, is a truism: but if it is meant to deny that they were inspired in any other sense, it comes nearer to a paradox, and is at all events an assertion which remains to be proved. The author indeed believes that he has here the authority of the Church expressly on his side, because "in her Collects she teaches all Christians to pray for the Holy Spirit, in terms fully as emphatical as those in which inspiration is ascribed to the sacred writers in the *Greek* of the New Testament:" from which he infers, that "the Church seems to hold that inspiration was not confined to the Apostles." And no doubt, in his sense of the word, the Church does most firmly hold this: but how it follows that, because she teaches her children throughout all ages to pray for the gifts of the Holy Spirit, she must hold that the sacred writers were not the subjects of inspiration in any other sense, and received no more direct illumination than every Christian at this day may reasonably expect in answer to his prayers, is more than I am able to understand. The Church, as I have observed, be it unhappily or happily, has not dogmatized on this point: she has not cast her view of the inspiration of Scripture in any stereotyped formula; but if we wish to gather it by inference from her words, we must at least reason from those in which she is speaking of the peculiar

Authority of the Church claimed for his views.

functions of the sacred writers, and not from those which refer to the ordinary experience of Christian men.

Failure of propositions to elucidate Sermons.

But it would only lead me away from the main point, if I were to proceed farther in the examination of these Propositions. For on the whole it appears to me that they throw very little light on the Sermons, but stand in great need of illustration from them: and that, if it is possible to arrive at a clear insight into the author's system, it will be by the study, not of the Propositions, but of the book. It is by means of that alone that anything like a complete estimate can be formed of his teaching, with regard to Revelation and Inspiration, to the relation between Scripture and the Church, and between the Old Dispensation and that of the New Testament. I shall make a few remarks on these points: and it will be convenient first to consider

Relation of Scripture to the Church.

the place which he assigns to Scripture in its relation to the Church: especially as this appears to be one, and perhaps the chief, ground of the complaint, that the statements of the book seriously affect the supremacy of Holy Scripture. Several of these statements very emphatically describe the relation of Scripture to the Church, as one of subsequence, of dependence, and therefore, as it may seem, of inferiority. The "volume of Holy Scripture," it is said in one passage, "embodies the experience of the Church of old; the record of her Revelations, and the tradition of her spiritual life; the transfusion, as it were, of her spirit into writing." * In another it is granted—as an admission which may safely be made to the Romanist as well as to many Anglicans—that "the Church was before the Bible, as a speaker is before his voice; and that Holy Scripture is not the foundation of the Christian faith so much as its creature, its expression, and its embodiment." It seems to have been thought that this language is at variance with the Divine origin of Scripture, and traces it to a human source.† But this appears to me a misap-

* Sermon XIX. "Servants of God speaking as moved by the Holy Ghost." I shall not think it necessary to give the page of each quotation.

† See "Rational Godliness by Rowland Williams, B.D. An Examination into the Author's Views on Holy Scripture, Sermon XIX. being specially considered, by the Rev. J. Powell Jones, B.D., Rector of Loughor."

prehension. There is certainly no contradiction between the statement that Scripture records the revelations of the Church, and the admission that those revelations proceeded from God. It is quite consistent to say that the Church was before the Bible, and that Revelation was before the Church: to say that Holy Scripture is not the foundation so much as the creature of the Christian faith, and yet that Revelation is not the creature so much as the foundation of that faith. One who asserts that the sacred writers only "expressed thoughts that were stirring in the breast of the Church," need not be supposed to deny that what they made known was "the mind of the Lord." No question is raised by such statements as to the origin of the Revelation, but only as to the mode of its transmission. The truth that the Church was before the Bible, is not the less certain because it has been abused by the Romanist: and it is confirmed by the testimony of the Bible itself. And then it follows that there must be a sense in which it is allowable and necessary to affirm, that Scripture embodies the experience, expresses the thoughts, makes known that which was the mind of the Church, no less than of the Lord. For otherwise it would have revealed a new faith, which had not been delivered to the Church by the teaching of Christ and his Apostles. Even with regard to St. Paul, it must be admitted that his doctrine had been that of the Church which he persecuted. Else he would have been the founder of a new religion. But his case shows that the conformity of the apostolical writings to the faith of the Church, proves nothing as to their immediate origin. As to those who had been deeply imbued with that faith, there might be room for doubt, whether any special, direct, heavenly communication was required, to enable them to expound it accurately. But of St. Paul we know, that he "neither received his gospel of man, neither was taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ." So that if his Epistles are said to be "utterances of the Church," it can only be in a sense widely different from that which the phrase naturally suggests, and which the whole context indicates to have been the author's true meaning.

But there is another point of view in which the supremacy of Scripture may appear to be more seriously endangered by some of his statements. The grounds on which he rests its claims to our reverence, do not seem to be of the highest order. He thinks it "reasonable to say" that "to ourselves as members of the Church of England, it must be the great standard of theological doctrine:" and he holds that "we justly regard it with veneration," and "exhorts every one to value it highly." But he appears to intimate that it is entitled to such veneration and esteem, rather as a monument of primitive antiquity, and as a record of the personal experience, thoughts, and feelings of holy men, especially "of those who walked with Christ, and heard the gracious words which He spake," than on account of its intrinsic value, or its peculiar and paramount authority, even as the perpetual rule of faith and practice. For he would have it acknowledged, "that this Holy Scripture has also something behind it deeper and far holier still:" and he proceeds to observe that "if that Spirit by which holy men spake of old, is for ever a living and a present power, its later lessons may well transcend its earlier, and there may reside in the Church a power of bringing out of her treasury things new as well as things old," where it is not obscurely implied, that the new things may well be the better.

Grounds of the Scripture's claims to reverence.

I should be sorry to put an invidious construction on this language. Though it may lend itself on the one hand to a Romish theory of development, on the other to the fancies of individual enthusiasts, I am persuaded that the author's meaning is equally remote from both. And I would not deny that there is a sense in which the statement may be accepted, and in which it will be found not only not to depreciate but to enhance the value and dignity of Holy Scripture. For the fulness of the stream is the glory of the fountain: and it is because the Ganges is not lost among its native hills, but deepens and widens until it reaches the ocean, that so many pilgrimages are made to its springs. And to the end of time there can be no assignable limit to the true development, and above all to the

Obscurity of meaning.

practical application of the truths contained in Holy Scripture: and so the later stages of this development may well "transcend the earlier, the new things be better than the old." But yet the very test by which the true development is distinguished from the false, the right application from the wrong, and by which it is discerned that the process is carried on under the guidance of the Spirit of truth, will be its constant subordination to the authority of the original rule, and that, not as a mere conventional standard, but as one superior to every other, in kind as well as in degree. I only lament that here, as in many other parts of his writings, the author's peculiar style or manner has obscured his meaning, so as to leave it doubtful whether he intended or would be willing to adopt such a qualification as I have pointed out.

Relation between Judaism and Christianity

But much more serious and perplexing doubts are suggested by his view of the Old Testament, and of the relation between Judaism and Christianity, which is unfolded in a sermon to which he himself refers as one "than which there is none in the volume which better expresses what may seem the peculiarities of his theology, or which he would sooner indicate as a key to the rest."* The simple but grave question which is raised by this view is: whether there is a place or room in his system, for any supernatural communication from God to man, before the coming of Christ. If there be, it is at least not clearly marked. All that others have referred to such a communication, seems there to resolve itself into a phenomenon, either of a law of nature or of God's providential government. There was indeed, according to this theory, a kind of real correspondence or analogy between the prophecies of the Old Dispensation, and the events of the New. But that correspondence was hidden in the depths of the Divine counsels, and never revealed to man, until Christ came to set up that "kingdom of the mind," in which it was to be made manifest to those who were enlightened to perceive it. "Thus in fact," we are told, "the great and emphatically true prophet was Almighty God." And all that is said of the human prophets points to the conclusion, that they only gave

* Sermon XIV. "The Kingdom of God a Kingdom of the Mind."

utterance to the religious instincts and aspirations of the Hebrew mind, in which, by the original constitution of its character, and its providential development, there was laid "a train of glowing hopes and vague anticipations," which were destined to be realized only in a sense wholly foreign to their nature and object, as prayer may be said to be answered, when the Divine wisdom, in its mercy and goodness, withholds that which is asked, and gives some totally different, but far better thing in its stead. Those hopes and anticipations were purely natural: for they not only fell far short of the spiritual reality, but were permitted to take a wrong direction, in which they were on the whole utterly disappointed, and the prophecies which expressed them remained unfulfilled.

Work of the Holy Spirit.

It may indeed seem as if a supernatural communication was sufficiently implied in the presence of the Holy Spirit, which is represented as filling an important part under the Old, as well as under the New Dispensation. * But when we look a little closer at the description given of the operations of this heavenly Agent, it rather suggests the notion of a regular perpetual universal indwelling, which belongs to the permanent order of Providence in the government of the world, and is no otherwise supernatural than as it is Divine. But so, we are reminded, "every gracious quality, every keen perception even of great mortal truths, is more or less from God:" and in another remarkable passage it is suggested as consistent with the more reasonable view of Providence, that "the Lord may write the Bible, on the same principle as the Lord builds the city:" † "for every part played by man comes from the Divine Disposer of the scene." The author sometimes limits the province of the Holy Spirit to the sphere of the affections and the conscience; ‡ at other times he describes the range of its operations as comprehending every function of man's intellectual nature: § but in every point of view he appears to extend it to all the families of the human race. The "Divine Teacher of mankind" "educates nations and

* Sermon XV. "The Spirit's Operations."
† Sermon XIX., p. 292. ‡ P. 294. § Sermon XV.

churches," which "represent, throughout fleeting generations, the everlasting Providence and Spirit of God." Also, "by the Spirit of God the ancient heroes founded kingdoms, and legislators devised laws, and the fair fabric of every science was reared," "the greatest triumphs achieved by the human mind, in undertakings which required a complete balance of all its powers, are due in some measure to the inspiration of the Holy Spirit." And once more: "if this has been the case with the giants, why not also with the masses?" why be "afraid of recognizing in the linked march of the nations, a career not unguided of God's good Spirit?"

I refer to these passages, not as meaning to deny that there may be a sense in which all this may be very truly said, but only to shew that there is nothing in this manifold agency of the Holy Spirit that implies any thing that can be properly called a supernatural communication of Divine truth. And then it would seem to follow, that in the author's scheme the first, and hitherto the last, communication of that kind in the history of the world is that which was made by what he calls "the positive Incarnation of the Son." This complete insulation may indeed appear to exalt the magnitude and importance of that event: but with reference to other parts of the author's theory, it rather suggests some perplexing doubts. For the main object of our Lord's coming in the flesh is represented to have been, to "produce a change in men's conceptions" of the Divine nature and dealings. And the revelation by which this change was produced, is described as "an expansion of the conscience," and especially as the "putting aside of much natural prejudice with all such local and personal predilections as acted upon the mind *like a veil* between its gaze and the true likeness of God." But it is not clear that there was any thing, either in the object or in the process, to require such a stupendous intervention of Divine power. For that "change in man's conceptions"—which are said to have been those of "ruder ages"—was apparently not radical and total, but rather a correction and enlargement, than the substitution of any thing absolutely new. And that revelation does not seem essentially to differ from

Its relation to the Incarnation.

the ordinary work attributed to the Holy Spirit in the education of mankind. And so, "if," as the author believes, "the destined course of the world be really one of providential progress," it may appear as if the whole of our Lord's prophetical office might very well have entered into it without any break in the natural sequence of events. It is true that the more mysterious sides of his character are more or less fully recognized: but it is not quite evident that they properly belong to the author's system, and have not rather been transferred to it from others in which they have a more natural and fitting place.

Tendency of the work.

I cannot therefore be surprised, that the work should in some minds have left the painful impression, that its ultimate tendency is to efface the distinction between natural and revealed religion. But I gladly declare my conviction, that if there be such a tendency in it, it is only in the letter of the book, and not in the consciousness of the author. And I can readily believe, that in this case, as in so many others, the man is better than his work; and that whatever he has said in depreciation of the letter as compared with the spirit, will be found applicable to himself: that the later lessons will transcend the earlier, and the new things prove better than the old. And especially I both hope and trust that his oral teaching is and will be more judiciously measured, more cautiously guarded, more exactly balanced, and in all respects less open to misconstruction than many parts of his writings. And I will add that I feel such confidence in his personal character, as assures me that the liberty he enjoys will be to him the most effectual of all restraints; and therefore I cannot even wish that it had been less. Where the constitution of a college invests the governing body with despotic authority, even the publication of a metaphysical paradox may be thought to justify the removal of a teacher, however conspicuous for a rare combination of the noblest qualities of mind and heart; for genius and eloquence, for piety and virtue, for energy and devotedness to the service of God and man. But I am not sure that the interests of such an institution are promoted by either the exercise or the possession of such a power. That which is actually lodged in the

Visitor of St. David's College, only enables him to deprive any of its officers for misconduct or incapacity. And thus they obtain a degree of independence in the performance of their duties, which is no doubt liable to abuse, and which renders it the more important to exert the utmost vigilance in the selection of those who are entrusted with it. But on the whole I regard it as an advantage, which I should be very loath to exchange for any additional security.

I now turn to a few other topics, on which I shall not need to occupy much more of your time.

I am happy to be able to speak thankfully and hopefully of the progress which has been made since we last met, in supplying the wants of the Diocese, both as to churches and schools. The number of the new or restored churches which have been completed in the course of the present year, denotes an increasing ratio; and the style of them all presents a cheering contrast to the slight, paltry, unsightly edifices which were the result of almost every attempt at church-building among us in the last generation, under the combined influence of bad taste and a false economy, which happily did not aim at providing for a very remote posterity. On the other hand, I have still to lament the difficulty which in small rural parishes continues to impede the execution of the most urgently needed rapairs; sometimes from the poverty of the parishioners, sometimes from the inertness or positive resistance of lay impropriators, who, though bound by the most sacred obligations of law, justice, honour, and religion, to keep chancels in repair, neglect and elude the performance of that duty. In other cases again, where a church-rate has been duly made, its collection is prevented by an organized system of chicanery, set in motion, as I have reason to believe, by an association instituted for that purpose. The partial success of such attempts must increase our anxiety for an equitable settlement of the whole question. But the spirit which they indicate is, I fear, rather gaining than losing strength in the quarter to which we have to look for such a settlement. Churches and schools.

The work of elementary education is likewise unhappily re-

tarded by causes over which its friends have no control. The general poverty of some extensive districts opposes an obstacle to the establishment and maintenance of schools, which can only be surmounted by aid from without. And such aid could not at present be extended to them by the State, without some relaxation of the rules which govern the dispensation of the public funds allotted to this object. In the early part of the year I for a time entertained a rather sanguine hope, that the peculiar circumstances of the Diocese, and particularly of the part of Radnorshire included in it, might have been considered as a sufficient ground for such an exceptional relaxation; but there were reasons which were thought to shew that it would be an unseasonable and dangerous departure from the principle on which the Parliamentary Education Grant has hitherto been administered. While I can only lament, without presuming to complain of this determination, I may at least hope that the Committee of Council will maintain that impartiality toward the various religious bodies which claim a share of its funds for their schools, by which its proceedings have hitherto been marked, and that it will not listen to the recommendation which it has received from one of its inspectors, who has thought proper to advise that it should modify its present system for the express purpose of favouring the schools of the British and Foreign School Society, at the expense of those which are connected with our Church throughout the Principality. This proposal is, I am afraid, a sample of the measure of justice which the Church has to expect from her adversaries, whenever they gain an ascendancy in the State; but at present it is, I trust, premature. And I venture to hope that the time is yet distant, when the efforts of the Church to promote the religious education of her children, will be directly and avowedly discouraged by any Government in this country.

Elementary education.

The peculiar difficulties in the way of the progress and extension of such education among us, presented by the prevalence of dissent, and the large number of children who are not members of the Established Church, are noticed for a very different purpose in the excellent Report of the

Report of Welsh Education Committee.

Welsh Education Committee, published this year, not as reasons for abandoning the object, but as requiring that "the management of Church schools be adapted to the actual position of the country in a spirit of forbearance and Christian tenderness." The maxim on which the Report grounds its recommendations on this head, is one of very extensive application, one which might have been thought an axiom of common sense, if it had not been so often practically contradicted: it is, that we should do as much good as we can, and should not refuse to do a little because we cannot do more, or as much as we would. But no doubt even when this principle is admitted to regulate the religious teaching in Church schools under such circumstances, the application of the principle to practice may often be very difficult, and may call for a degree of judgment and tact which is by no means common. It is with reference to the same subject that a startling announcement was made by the Rev. H. L. Jones, Her Majesty's Inspector of Schools, in his General Report, for the year 1855, on the Church of England Schools inspected in Wales. He there expressed his deliberate conviction, that "unless religion in the parochial system of Welsh education is to fall away instead of advancing, the immediate and united action of the four Bishops is imperatively necessary." And the specific evils which call for such action are stated to be those which arise from "anarchy, neglect, and incapacity." "These three sources of evil," it is observed, "are of more frequent occurrence than they should be; and some means of obviating them must be found, or religious instruction will suffer greatly from the result." Here, with regard to neglect and incapacity, the only thing that seemed difficult to understand was how, if the remedy of the evil lay within the power of the Bishops, it could be more effectually applied by their united action than by that of each in his own Diocese. But the allusion to *anarchy*, without some farther explanation, was quite unintelligible. The Rev. Inspector afterwards explained his meaning in two letters, both of which have been published.* And it now appears that the

Religious instruction in the Principality.

* See "A Letter to the Clergy of the Diocese of Llandaff, in reference to the

"anarchy" which he had in view, consists in the absence of a uniform system imposed by the authority of the Bishops on the Clergy and managers of schools, both as to the amount and the special character of the religious instruction given in Church schools. That in both these respects a great diversity should be found, was to be expected everywhere, but above all under the circumstances of the Principality. And it cannot be denied, that such diversity is at the best a necessary evil. But how little desirable it would be, even if possible, to obviate it by a uniformity of system, which should compel the Clergy and school-managers to observe the same rule as to the amount of religious instruction, may be gathered—if it is not self-evident—from the observations to which I have already referred in the Report of the Welsh Education Committee. The other point raises a still greater difficulty. The Rev. Inspector "perceives the existence of anarchy still more," when he "finds in neighbouring schools the opposite extremes of the religious opinions which are allowed to divide the Church into two totally distincts sects, strictly maintained in the religious instruction given to the children." * But if this kind of anarchy is to be reduced to order by the united action of the ecclesiastical authorities, it seems clear that their own unanimity on the subject must be an indispensable condition of their mutual co-operation. It must be a pleasure to believe that such unanimity actually exists, without the slightest variance, among the present occupiers of the four Welsh Sees; though it would be hardly safe to assume, as the writer appears to do, that it necessarily pervades the whole episcopal body. But even if this were the case, it would not be obvious that the Bishops—still less that any four of them—possess the means either of reconciling the conflicting opinions which are "allowed to divide the Church," or to terminate the dispute by a decision in favour of either party. And until this is done, it would seem that the difference must continue

Absence of a uniform system.

Maintenance of opposite religious opinions.

Report of Her Majesty's Inspector of Schools," by the Bishop of the Diocese; and "A Letter to the Lord Bishop of Llandaff in Reply," by the Inspector of the District.

* P. 8.

to affect the character of the religious teaching in the school as well as in the Church.

But though the remedy which has been proposed may be inappropriate and inapplicable, it will not follow either that the evil does not exist, or that we ought to resign ourselves to it, as one which we can neither remove nor mitigate. As to the alleged anarchy indeed, I have heard nothing from any other quarter. But the results of the inquiry instituted in the course of this year by the National Society, through some of the Clergy of the Diocese who kindly undertook the task, disclose a lamentable deficiency in the number of schools: and the Reports which I have received from Mr. Stammers of the observations which he has made in the course of his successive circuits in the Diocese, as organizing master, show that the quality of the instruction, both secular and religious, is in many schools very unsatisfactory. It would no doubt be a mistake to refer either of these defects to any single cause; but I think there is reason to believe that to some extent they might both be corrected by the use of the same means. The Report of Her Majesty's Inspector, on which I have already commented, insists strongly on the need of some modification of the existing Minutes of the Committee of Council, to meet the peculiar exigencies of the Principality. This is a kind of assistance for which we must depend on the will of others, and for which we may yet have long to wait. But it is so much the more important to consider, whether the resources of the Diocese itself have been drawn forth as far as is immediately practicable, and whether all which are actually available are dispensed to the greatest possible advantage. As to this last point, I find but one opinion expressed by those who have had the best opportunities of information, with regard to the general inefficiency of the temporary schools supported by the Bevan Charity; and it seems clear that, while the instruction which they diffuse is of the lowest order, the system under which the Charity is at present administered, rather obstructs than promotes the progress of sound elementary education. "The effect of its present opera-

Insufficient and inefficient schools.

Remedies.

The Bevan Charity.

tions," it is observed in one of the Reports which I have received, "is to diminish individual exertion." If the benefits which it yields were far greater than they appear to be, they could never compensate the injury indicated by this simple remark. I am convinced that, under a different system, the funds of the Charity might be made to contribute at once to the multiplication of permanent schools, and to the improvement of those which now exist. This must always depend in a great measure on the amount of remuneration which can be offered to the teacher; not of course as an operative cause, but as a necessary condition. And certainly it cannot be said, that the means to be found within the Diocese, of raising the ordinary standard of that remuneration to a height at which it would command the services of trained teachers, have yet been exhausted.

Establishment of schools.

I have on previous occasions gratefully acknowledged the exertions which have been made in many parts of the Diocese for the establishment of schools. But its collective efforts for the like purpose are measured by the amount of the yearly subscriptions received by the Church Union Society. And though that amount has of late years been somewhat increased by collections made in churches, it still falls far short of what might be reasonably expected, and, in fact, with the exception of those collections, represents little more than the contributions of the Clergy. I am persuaded that it would be unjust to the lay-members of the Church, to attribute this fact to a general indifference on their part, and not to the absence of sufficient information, or the extensive prevalence of misconception with regard to the object to which this branch of the Society's operations are and have been exclusively directed. With the view of guarding against the mistake which is so naturally suggested by the name of the Society, that of supposing this object to be one in which the Clergy have some peculiar professional interest, it has been resolved that what has hitherto been known as the Committee of the Society, shall in future bear the title of the Education Board of the Diocese; and it is designed to subdivide it, so that there shall be one in each archdeaconry, which shall collect and

administer its own funds. And it is hoped that this new organization may attract not only the pecuniary aid, but the personal co-operation, of the laity.

Personal superintendence of the clergy.

Yet I must remind my reverend brethren, that whatever may be the success of this or of any other attempt to augment the funds destined to educational purposes, the real ultimate benefit to the Church will depend mainly on themselves. Praiseworthy as are the exertions and sacrifices which many of them have made in order to provide schools for their respective parishes, it must be remembered that these are only to be regarded in the light of means to an end; and that, if after this has been done, they should withhold their personal attention and superintendence from the work, there will be a certainty that the end will be but very imperfectly attained, and great danger that the cost and labour may have been almost utterly wasted.

Support of the Church Societies.

There is yet another subject on which I feel myself obliged to say a few words. Manifold and urgent as are the wants of this Diocese, they have never prevented us—and I trust never will prevent us—from contributing in our measure to the support of the various Societies, through which the Church of England strives to fulfil certain parts of her duty, for which no provision has been made in her ancient endowment, such as the extension of facilities for public worship and of pastoral superintendence, the education of her poor children, the preservation of the Gospel among our countrymen settled in our colonies, and the propagation of it in all parts of the world. From some of these Societies indeed we have received so much benefit, that whatever we contribute to their funds, ought to be considered not merely as a free-will offering, but as the payment of a debt. This remark applies especially to the Church Building Society and the National Society. But with regard to those which have no such special claim upon us, particularly the Societies through which the Church carries on her missionary work, our co-operation is at once a duty and a privilege; and we could not, without loss and hurt to ourselves, renounce our share

in this labour of Christian love. The withdrawal of the Royal sanction which used to be given to periodical collections in behalf of three of those Societies, has in its immediate effect operated to their disadvantage. But as it cannot affect the ground on which their claims are based, it is to be hoped that it will not permanently contract their means of usefulness. And it is at least satisfactory to know, that it need not be considered as an indication even of indifference, much less of hostility, to the objects which they seek to promote, on the part of those who are immediately responsible for it. The real origin of the proceeding, which certainly at first wore that appearance, has since been cleared up by a document which I received last year, and which is styled "A Declaration respecting the use of 'Episcopal' in lieu of 'Queen's' Letters." It is now evident that the whole transaction has been a manœuvre, prompted by a feeling of emulation, which, if it had been kept within its proper limits, would have been highly praiseworthy, but which, on this occasion, seems to have degenerated into a very mean and unholy jealousy. Some Societies—or rather most probably the agents of some Societies—which had not shared in that mark of Royal approbation which has been recently withheld, appear to have conceived that whatever advantage was withdrawn from those whom they looked upon as their rivals, would be so much gained for themselves. I am afraid it will turn out that they have only succeeded in one half of their object, and have inflicted an injury from which none will derive the smallest benefit. It was however quite natural that, having effected the discontinuance of the Queen's Letters, they should wish to suppress all similar manifestations of sentiment on the part of the Bishops; though it was less to have been expected that they should have attempted to do so under colour of respect for episcopal authority, which is put forward in the Declaration as one of the principal motives which animated those who affixed their signature to it. And the noble person who, as I learn from a letter which accompanied the copy forwarded to me, has taken the lead in this movement, and to whose influence, as there is

Withdrawal of the 'Queen's Letters.'

Origin of it.

good reason to believe, its success, such as it is, has been principally owing, had not previously been so distinguished by his peculiar sensitiveness as to the respect due to episcopal authority, or by his intense solicitude for the maintenance of ecclesiastical discipline, as to warrant a surmise that this was the weak side by which he had been won to lend himself as an instrument for carrying out such a design.

I therefore rejoice that the number of the Clergy of my Diocese who have suffered their names to be appended to this Declaration, is exceedingly small—very little over a dozen; and I feel sure that if they had more maturely considered its contents, they could not have failed to perceive the hollowness and absurdity of the pretexts which it alleges to cover its real object. As to the Bishops, it proceeds on one of two suppositions. It implies either that in their exhortations to their Clergy, with which they accompanied the Royal Letters, they acted in a purely mechanical subservience to the civil authority, and used language which did not really express any judgment or feeling of their own; or else that, having been in earnest, and having meant what they said, they were bound either to retract or to conceal their opinion as soon as it ceased to be endorsed with the Royal sanction, or, more properly, with that of the first Minister of the Crown. This is the substance of that which the framers of this document, and the noble Earl who is chiefly responsible for it, would fain have to be regarded as a delicate mark of respect for episcopal authority. As to the Clergy, the danger which these persons profess to apprehend from the issuing of the Episcopal Letters is, lest "it may oblige the Clergy either to disregard the injunction of their Bishop, or, out of deference to his office, to advocate a cause they do not cordially approve." But this is simply a palpable mistake as to a matter of fact. No doubt those letters always assume that the cause which they recommend is one with which both the Clergy and the faithful Laity feel some degree of sympathy; as indeed it would be no less hard than painful to believe, that there is any Churchman who deliberately and conscientiously disapproves of

False pretences of the Declaration.

Alleged danger to the clergy.

the objects for which the Societies in question were instituted. But if such a case should unhappily occur, the Letters could not be intended to oblige the Clergy to advocate a cause they do not approve; nor do I believe that any clergyman ever felt himself placed by such Letters in the embarrassing position which the Declaration describes. None could doubt that, under the circumstances supposed, he would be doing all that was required of him, if he read the statement and letter transmitted to him, and so left the whole matter in the hands of his congregation. This danger therefore is purely imaginary and fictitious. But the supposition involved in the suggestion of it is injurious and insulting alike to the Bishops and to the Clergy.

To the laity.

But the Declaration points out another like danger which threatens the Laity from the same cause: "It may oblige the Laity either to neglect the appeal of their pastor, or to support, by their offerings, a Society which has not their sympathy." On this it may suffice to remark, that no clergyman who has signed this Paper can ever again consistently preach a sermon in behalf of any religious Society. For he can never have a right to presume that there exists in his congregation a perfect unanimity on a subject as to which he himself may happen to differ from his Diocesan: and unless such unanimity prevails among them, some of them "must either neglect his appeal, or support by their offerings a Society which has not their sympathy." And thus he usurps that very authority over them, which he has protested against as a yoke and a fetter when exerted by his Bishop toward himself. I wish this had occurred to some of my Reverend Brethren, who I believe are in the laudable habit of making pretty frequent appeals to their congregations in favour of some Societies, before they signed this document, and that they had reflected for a moment, that their signature must either stop their mouths on such occasions, or convict them of the most glaring inconsistency. Finally, to complete this series of false pretences, the subscribers to the Declaration are made to profess a tender regard for the welfare of the Societies against which it is levelled. It represents them as suffering, or as in danger of

incurring serious detriment from the favour which they receive. The issuing of such letters, it is alleged, "holds out an inducement to the Society to rest its claim to public support, not so much upon the importance of the work in which it is engaged, or the principles on which it rests, as upon the official patronage it may be able to secure." In the mouth of avowed enemies or strangers to our Church, such language would at least be consistent and intelligible. For they would be at liberty to assume, that the episcopal patronage is sought and given without respect either to the importance of the work in which the Society is engaged, or to the principles on which it rests. But it is not so clear how such a supposition can be made by clergymen with either justice or decency. And without it, that is, if the patronage is bestowed, not at random or from sinister motives, but just on account of the importance of the work, and in approbation of the principles on which the Society rests, it will be evident that this objection is as groundless as all those which precede it. But it is so contrived as to imply an imputation equally offensive to the Bishops whom the subscribers profess to respect, and to the Societies which they affect to befriend. I am ready however to believe that they are not chargeable with anything worse than thoughtlessness and rashness, or at the most that they have only been blinded by party spirit; and I neither know nor care to inquire, who are the real authors of that which I consider as a gross outrage on truth, decency, and common sense.

Professed regard for the Societies.

As to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, I have always felt it my duty to give whatever support I could contribute to its cause by my "official patronage," not only from my sense of the importance of its work, and my approbation of the principles by which it is governed, but also because I believe that its value and its merits are not duly appreciated in this Diocese. It seems to be commonly conceived, that the two Societies through which the Church discharges her missionary functions, are engaged in precisely the same work, but carry it on in somewhat different ways; and that the only question between them is, which way is to be

Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts.

preferred. It is not, I believe, sufficiently understood, that they are occupied with different tracts of the vast missionary field: but that the work of the elder Society is entitled to precedence, because it is that which has been most clearly assigned to us as a nation by Divine Providence, as a duty incident to that imperial sway with which we have been entrusted in so many regions of the earth. No missionary efforts in any other direction, however wide their range, can make amends for the neglect of that duty. I will add that the recent events in the East, which have filled our hearts with grief and horror, while they so fearfully illustrate the hollowness, and comparative worthlessness of all civilization which is not rooted in Christianity, serve in my opinion to strengthen the claims of a Society, which combines large views and active zeal with prudent moderation and calm discretion.

Which is the best plan of providing for this and other objects of Christian charity, is quite another question, one no less important than difficult, and which will, I trust, engage more and more of the attention of the Church, until it has found its true solution. But I will not dissemble my conviction, that none will be entirely satisfactory, which does not at least include among its elements a return to the primitive apostolical method of collection on the first day of the week. Other modes of drawing forth the resources of Christian charity may be, immediately, more productive. That any, or all of them together, would be so on the whole, and at the end of the reckoning, there is good reason to doubt, or rather utterly to disbelieve. But the others are all perfectly consistent with the regular use of this. Its peculiar advantage is, that there is no other which tends so directly and certainly to cherish the spirit which it calls into action. And in comparison with the benefit of nourishing and diffusing this spirit, the actual amount of any pecuniary offering is quite insignificant. When that which is cast into the treasury of the Church is merely the conventional sign of a thing absent, when it is wrung from reluctant hands by the force of custom, and even when it is the produce of a transient emotion stirred by an eloquent appeal, it is of little worth in the sight of God, and even with regard to the

Weekly collections.

end for which it is destined, its value is exactly measured by its quantity. But what calculation can estimate the preciousness of the gift which is brought to the altar as the thank-offering of a devout and cheerful heart! While the false token can yield no increase, this bears a stamp by which it represents a blessing beyond all price. Even in a far lower point of view, I am persuaded that no habit would be more beneficial both to rich and poor, than that, in conformity with the apostolical order, "every one should lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him, on the first day of the week," for charitable and religious purposes.

And of this at least, my brethren, we may be well assured, that in such a spirit lies the strength and the hope of the Church. Its growth is the surest sign of her prosperity. Her life is not to be quickened by the heat of controversy, but by the fire of love. When that waxes cold, offences must multiply, and iniquity abound. And as the worst tendency of our unhappy divisions is to quench that spirit, so it alone can effectually remedy the other evils which spring from them. This is the surest test by which we can try the other spirits, whether they be of God: the test therefore which we ought to be ever applying to our own. And while we pray that it may be more and more shed abroad in our hearts, let us try it also by its fruits, and beware that we never rest satisfied with any other proof of its presence, than a continual and progressive abounding in the work of the Lord.

APPENDIX.

(A.)

The Immaculate Conception.

It is to be regretted that whatever attention has been recently drawn to this subject among English Protestants, has been almost confined to its dogmatical side, and that the historical importance of the innovation, as it marks a new era in the constitution of the Papal Church, has been generally overlooked. The Abbé Laborde justly describes the ultimate object of the whole transaction, as a "coup d'état ecclésiastique, par où l'épiscopat devait demeurer anéanti" (p. 70, note). This view of the matter is strongly confirmed by Cardinal Gousset's collection of documents, which will be found extremely instructive by every one who is sufficiently interested in the question to examine its contents. The unanimity of the prelates, whose opinions he reports, on the tenet itself, is evidently in the Cardinal's eye a secondary point, in comparison with their belief in the individual infallibility of the Pope. He not only never fails to give the utmost possible prominence to every expression of that belief, but does not hesitate to assure the reader that it exists where it is not expressed. So p. 535, as to the Archbishop of Rouen, "quoiqu'il n'ait point déclaré formellement, qu'il s'en rapportait au jugement infaillible du Vicaire de Jésu-Christ, on n'a pu douter un instant de sa parfaite soumission à l'autorité du Pasteur Suprême de l'Eglise." See p. 206, as to the Bishop of Chartres, and generally as to the construction to be put on the silence of the Bishops, p. 683; and the correction which he administers to the Bishop of Evreux, who had ventured not only to deprecate the definition of doctrine, but to qualify his submission with the words, "Je déclare me soumettre au jugement du Saint Siége Apostolique *et de la majorité des Evêques.*" The Cardinal takes that occasion to observe (p. 272), that the judgment of the Apostolical See includes that of every Bishop who is in communion with the Church of Rome, Mother and Mistress of all the Churches. In the preface indeed he lays down the doctrine as already beyond controversy: though his anxiety to exhibit the testimonies of the prelates who incidentally profess

their belief in it, betrays his consciousness that it stands in need of their suffrage. According to him, the authority of the Pope in matters of faith, far outweighs that of the whole Episcopate in Council, which, without the papal sanction, is null, and, with it, superfluous (p. iii.). But still it would seem, the vote of each Bishop, given in his closet, may contribute its share toward establishing that long-disputed supremacy.

The Pope however, while he reserved the final decision of the question for his own infallible judgment, had condescended to consult his "Venerable Brethren" by his Circular issued from Gaeta. What that inquiry should have been, if it was to furnish a groundwork for a dogmatical decree, is well stated by Laborde, p. 90. "If," says the Abbé, "he had seriously wished to learn from every Bishop the faith of his Church, and his own episcopal judgment, he might have said, Let us know whether your Church holds and has always held the Immaculate Conception as an article of faith revealed in the Scriptures, preached by the Apostles, and handed down by the tradition of the Catholic Church. Judge this question canonically in council with your comprovincial Bishops, and in a regular synod; then send your judgment to me, that after having received the testimony and judgment of all the Churches, if this judgment is uniform, I may add my own to it, and declare that such is the faith and the judgment of the universal Church. But instead of this, the question proposed was as to the devotion of the Clergy and people of each Diocese with regard to the Immaculate Conception, and the sentiments and wishes of each Bishop (ut majori qua fieri potest celeritate Nobis significare velitis, qua devotione vester Clerus, Populusque fidelis erga Immaculatæ Virginis Conceptionem sit animatus, et quo desiderio flagret, ut ejusmodi res ab Apostolica Sede decernatur, atque imprimis quid Vos ipsi de re ipsâ sentiatis, quidque exoptetis)." According therefore to the Pope's view, the most important evidence that could be furnished by the voice of the whole Episcopate to guide or confirm his judgment, was the actual state of opinion and feeling on the subject. And accordingly, several of the Bishops rely mainly on the present prevalence of the popular persuasion, as the chief ground of their own belief, and as capable of supplementing the acknowledged imperfection of the Scriptural and traditional testimony. (See especially the Letters of the Bishops of Majorca, p. 384, and Ferentino, p. 281.) The Abbé Laborde indeed (speaking it must be supposed of France) questions the alleged prevalence of the opinion among the Laity (p. 64), and with regard to the Clergy adds this remarkable statement: "As to the ecclesiastics, members of the monastic orders of either sex, priests, and even bishops, for the most part they do not count. In fact they profess to have no opinion of their own on any thing. According to the system of *blind obedience*, which is now in the ascendant, every one of them thinks, says, and preaches only what his superior bids him think, say, and

preach, without troubling himself to know whether it is true. They would believe that they were guilty of mortal sin, if they had any conviction. *Cæci sunt, et duces cæcorum* (Matt. xv. 14). This system of blindness is the rule of the Jesuits, and the actual teaching of the seminaries."

But assuming the almost universal prevalence of the belief both among the Clergy and the Laity, we have to observe, that it is admitted on all hands to have been constantly spreading, especially in the few last centuries, until it reached its present extent of general reception. And it is no less clear from the documents supplied by Cardinal Gousset, that the present state of opinion on the subject is the result of a system, partly of violence and intimidation, partly of misrepresentation and delusion, which was carried on during the same period with increasing activity. Every expression of the adverse opinion was forbidden by the highest authority, and exposed every one who ventured upon it to personal danger. In Portugal (as the Pope is informed by the Bishop of Faro, p. 278) "the three Estates of the realm, in 1646, pledged themselves by oath to defend the Immaculate Conception even at the peril of life, and decreed that whoever should dare to violate that vow and solemn oath, should, if a citizen, be immediately banished from the territory of the empire; if king, be exposed to the wrath of God and to their imprecation" (and as it would seem to the loss of his crown; for this appears to be signified by the words of the decree, 'et nostrorum seriem interrumpat'). Similar engagements were very common elsewhere. The Spanish ardour in the cause is well known (*propension innée des Espagnols*, according to the Bishop of Lugo, p. 374). It appears however from the letter of the Archbishop of Valencia (p. 640), that on the 8th of December, 1530, being the Festival of the Immaculate Conception, a preacher named Moner had ventured to maintain the contrary opinion in the pulpit of the cathedral of that city. The result was so great a scandal, that, to satisfy the demands of the Chapter, the indignation of the magistrates, and the tumultuous movements of the crowd, it was found necessary that very day to exile the rash orator (compare p. 497 and 841), and the next day to celebrate the Feast of the Immaculate Conception anew: and on this occasion all the members of the monastic orders who were present, took an oath to defend the glorious privilege of the Virgin both in public and private, to the utmost of their power; and it was resolved that in future no chair or diploma of the University should be granted to any one before he had taken the like oath. A statute to the same effect was passed by the Divinity Faculty in the University of Paris in 1496. The Universities of Coimbre, Manilla, Vienna, and Cologne (see Gousset under Lisbonne, Manilla, Vienna, and Cologne) exacted the like pledge, as did a great number of other learned bodies and cathedral chapters. On the whole, it is certain that to be suspected of holding a different opinion, or even of questioning

the favourite doctrine, was for every one more or less unsafe and inconvenient, and for a clergyman a sure bar to preferment.

Again, the extent to which the popular ignorance and credulity has been abused, may be partly estimated from the unfeigned uneasiness expressed by some of the Bishops, lest the happy security of their flocks should be disturbed when they learnt for the first time that the question remained to be decided. So the Bishop of Santander (p. 559), "les simples fidèles vivaient avec une telle sécurite dans cette croyance, *que l'Encyclique était venue les troubler en quelque sorte, en leur faisant croire, que son objet était encore en question.*" So at Sinigaglia (p. 577): "beaucoup de fidèles ignoraient si la question avait été décidée ou non par l'Eglise, et si elle avait besoin de l'être." So at Sion in Switzerland: "le peuple jouissait paisiblement de sa pieuse croyance, au point qu'il aurait soupçonné d'hérésie le moindre doute, *et qu'on aurait besoin d'user de précautions en lui annoncant la définition prochainement attendue, pour éviter de causer aux simples de l'étonnement et du trouble*" (p. 580). So at Wurzburg (p. 674): "le peuple croit simplement cette vérité, comme il croit les dogmes de foi:" no doubt, just as the converts of the Sandwich Islands (p. 558): "quoique peu instruits des choses de la foi, n'éprouvent aucune difficulté à admettre cette croyance;" and at Tonquin Oriental (p. 610): "le clergé indigène et le peuple fidèle qui n'avaient aucune idée des controverses théologiques, n'éprouvaient ni doute ni hésitation dans leur croyance." But at German Spires also (p. 588): "ceux qui n'étaient pas initiés aux controverses théologiques la *rangeaient au nombre des dogmes.*" At Spalatro (p. 587): "le peuple en était si pénetré, et avait tant de dévotion pour cette prérogative de Marie, qu'il avait fallu *user de prudence en prescrivant les prières publiques selon les vues de l'Encyclique.*" At Sonora (p. 585): "*Proposer au peuple cet article de foi, comme étant encore à définir, ce serait chose étrange à ses yeux.* Ignorant les décrets des Souverains Pontifes à ce sujet, il traiterait d'impie et de blasphémateur quiconque avancerait une assertion en sens contraire." These examples might be multiplied. Compare the letters from Livourne, p. 368; Coire, p. 225; Cabu, p. 197; Cassano, p. 191; Braga, p. 159; Albe-Royale, p. 46; Agria, p. 35. It is evident that this wide-spread error has been not only permitted, but studiously cherished and inculcated by the Clergy.

It was indeed a very natural, almost unavoidable, consequence of the devotional practices in which the people have been trained. It must be difficult for them to understand how the Church, by the authority of Popes and Councils, could sanction a Festival in honour of a doctrine which was only a pious opinion, and not an article of faith. And most of the Bishops themselves now refer to the Festival as one of the strongest proofs of the truth of the doctrine; mostly appearing to forget that the question proposed to them affected not its truth, but its certainty,

as a dogma of the Church, and that this certainty could not be proved, or in the slightest degree confirmed, by the sanction which had been given to the celebration, while the tenet was confessedly not an article of faith; though undoubtedly the argument implies a very grave and well-merited censure on all who had taken a share in so misdirecting the devotion of the people to an uncertain object. But Cardinal Gousset's volume discloses some rather curious facts with regard to the Festival itself, which will help to show how far it can serve to supply the absence of Scriptural and patristic authority. The antiquity of the observance is variously stated. The faithful people of Cadiz indeed (p. 169) claim it as one of their glories that the Festival had been celebrated in their cathedral from Apostolical times. But the Synod of Baltimore (p. 117) was not aware that it had been introduced in the West before the ninth century. And the English Romanists do not trace theirs farther back than the end of the eleventh (p. 669). But the more important question is as to the meaning or object of the Festival; for on this it must entirely depend whether it proves any thing even as to the relative antiquity of the belief which it is now alleged to confirm. The Bull *Ineffablis* itself alludes to a diversity of opinion on this point, and states that the Popes had proscribed the opinion of those who affirmed that the Church did not intend by the Festival to celebrate the Conception, but only the Sanctification, of the Virgin. Which however of these interpretations is likely to have been the earlier and the more correct, may be safely left to the judgment of every intelligent and impartial reader. The Papal determination of the dispute can only be accepted as decisive by those who go to the extreme ultramontane length of asserting the Pope's infallibility even in matters of fact. The Bishop of Aversa still thinks it necessary to observe (p. 103), "that his Church, when it solemnly celebrates the Festival of the Immaculate Conception, does not propose merely to honour the dignity of the person who was chosen to be the Mother of the Son of God, but the sanctification of her soul in the first instant at which it was created and united to her mortal body." The Synod of Baltimore (p. 117) makes the curious remark, that in the East the Festival was observed from the fifth century, under the title of the Conception of St. Anne, mother (according to a worthless legend) of the Holy Virgin. So that either St. Anne shared the privilege now attributed to St. Mary, or the title of the Festival in honour of St. Mary may have referred, not to her parentage, but to her maternity; as the Abbé Laborde justly remarks with regard to a large part of the quotations from the Fathers in the Bull: "les Pères y exaltent, par des éloges souvent figurés et hyperboliques, selon le genre oratoire, la sainteté, l'innocence, la pureté ineffable de la conception et de l'enfantement par lequel elle a conçu et enfanté le Sauveur, et non point du tout la conception par laquelle elle a été conçue elle-même, comme on l'assure frauduleusement dans ce passage de la bulle." It is in this point of

view very remarkable, that the Armenian Archbishop Primate of Constantinople (p. 237), after asserting the universal belief of his nation in the Immaculate Conception, goes on to say, that, having carefully examined what the Armenian Fathers had thought of the question, he had found that, from the first ages of the Church, they confessed in the ecclesiastical hymns,—what? not the modern dogma, but the very doctrine which the Popes, as the Bull states, had *proscribed* as an erroneous interpretation of the object of the Festival, namely, "que la Vierge Marie a été bénie dans le sein de sa Mère, et qu'elle en est sortie exempte de toute tâche."

Among the various ways in which the belief has been impressed on the minds of the faithful, none is more notable than that described by the Bishop of Amalfi, who (p. 58) "faisait remarquer que son Eglise était en possession des restes mortels de Saint André, et il leur attribuait *une puissance persuasive en faveur du privilege du culte et de l'amour de l'Immaculée Conception.*" That a Bishop of Amalfi should be capable of such absurdity, or of superstition which can hardly be paralleled except in African Fetish worship, might not be surprising. But it is a French Cardinal, Archbishop of Rheims, who transcribes the remark, in utter unconsciousness that there is any thing in it ridiculous or offensive. The (pretended) epistle of the priests and deacons of Achaia, in which both the Bishop and the Cardinal himself find "a precious testimony in favour of the Immaculate Conception," is just as irrelevant as the language of the hymns cited by the Armenian Primate.

The late Archbishop of Paris, M. Sibour, "after having consulted the ablest theologians of his diocese, and having himself most carefully examined and weighed the whole matter as in the Divine presence," arrived at the following conclusions:—"1st, That according to the principles of theology, the Immaculate Conception of the most Holy Virgin does not admit of being defined (n'est pas définissable) as a truth of Catholic faith (comme vérité de foi catholique), and in no case can be imposed as a belief binding under penalty of eternal damnation. 2nd, That a definition of any kind, even if the Church or the Holy See believed it had power to make one, would not be seasonable (opportune), for it would add nothing to the glory of the Immaculate Virgin, and might be detrimental to the peace of the Church, and the welfare of souls, especially in his diocese." The sole advantage which could result from the definition deprecated by M. Sibour, is very plainly stated by the Bishop of Valladolid, who wished for one. The answer which he received from his Clergy was this (p. 643), "que tous tenaient à la pieuse croyance de l'Immaculée Conception, comme si déjà elle eût été rangée parmi les dogmes de la foi, et que sa définition solemnelle ne leur apporterait désormais que *le droit de reconnaître des hérétiques dans ceux qui pourraient s'en écarter.*" That was all they would gain by the definition: the right of denouncing as hereties all who might differ from

them on this point. Therefore, as the Bishop assures the Pope, they would welcome the decree *with extreme joy*. For the same reason the Archbishop of Cuba, elected Archbishop of Burgos, was transported with delight by the prospect of this event (p. 253): "Oh! quel heureux jour, que celui où l'on entendra cet oracle du Siége Apostolique: Il faut croire que la Très-Sainte Mère de Dieu a été exempte de la tâche originelle, dont le genre humain a été souillé à cause du péché d'Adam. Celui qui ne croira pas que la Vierge, Mère de Dieu, a été conçue sans péché, *qu'il soit anathème*. Ce sera le jour que le Seigneur aura fait: *Nous nous réjouirons, et nous tressaillerons d'allégresse*."

This would be bad enough in itself. But the worst is, that the same fiendish wickedness is, by direct necessary implication, imputed to the Blessed Virgin herself, for whose greater *honour and glory* the damnatory decree has been pronounced. May we not here more fitly apply the words of the Psalmist: "His delight was in cursing, and it shall happen unto him. He clothed himself with cursing like as with a raiment: and it shall come into his bowels like water, and like oil into his bones." A new right—not of believing, not of worshipping, for that existed before to the fullest extent, but—of cursing, of branding with heresy, is, so far as the faithful are concerned, the single result of the proceedings, which, from February, 1849, to December, 1854, appear to have occupied so large a part of the attention of the whole Roman Communion. The Abbé Laborde does not speak too strongly when he calls that which has been done at Rome, "un véritable *crime*, dont rendront compte à Dieu ceux qui y ont participé" (p. 74). Yet the perversion of moral feeling which it indicates is the smallest part of the evil or the sin. The final and complete centralization of all authority in the person of the Pope, the virtual absorption of the Episcopate in the Papacy, as it was probably the main object of the whole transaction, is certainly its most important and most pernicious effect. The nature of the occasion on which this power has been usurped, marks and determines the spirit in which it will be continually exercised. It may seem difficult to conceive that the state of Christianity can ever sink below that which is exhibited in Cardinal Gousset's volume. But it is certain that the malign influence of the spiritual despotism which has just reached its climax, will make itself felt more and more the longer it lasts. The recent triumph over historical truth, Christian charity, and ecclesiastical order, is no doubt only one of a long series yet to come. The debasement of Christianity, the extinction of all true spiritual life, must henceforward be progressive, and will probably manifest themselves in many still more extravagant and monstrous forms: but only until the designs of Providence shall be revealed upon this mystery of iniquity, which, however it may work and seemingly prosper for a season, is assuredly reserved for destruction in His appointed time.

(B.)

On the History of the Eucharistic Controversy.

Mr. Freeman has shown so much ability and research in the first part of his work on the "Principles of Divine Service," that any opinions which he may advance in the course of it must carry great weight with his readers, and, if erroneous, will be likely to lead many astray. I am therefore sorry to be obliged to express my dissent from many of the statements contained in the Introduction to Part II. Its "design"—as he describes it in the *Monitum* prefixed to it—"is to unravel, by means of an historical survey of the ancient belief concerning the Holy Eucharist, viewed as a mystery, and of the later departures from it, the manifold confusions which have grown up around the subject, more especially since the fatal epoch of the eleventh century." In this Introduction the author appears to me to have indulged in a licence of speculation for which I was not prepared by the sobriety of judgment which he shows in the first Part. But it is with his "historical survey" that I am at present concerned. I believe that it is not only incorrect in many particulars, but fundamentally erroneous, and that it places the great turning-point of the history of the Eucharistic controversy in a totally false light. He himself is aware that his view of the origin of the controversy is opposed to the generally received opinion: indeed he has not been able to cite any writer who agrees with him in it: though it may be questioned whether he knows the amount of authority which might be set in array against him, as I believe it includes every writer on the subject who deserves to be named. He is also conscious that his view is not only singular, but paradoxical. For he admits (p. 38) that "there is indeed at first sight a clear opposition" between two statements of doctrine, which he nevertheless holds to be consistent with each other. It is therefore the more to be lamented, that while standing thus absolutely alone on the most momentous point of the whole discussion—the origin of the controversy—he should have treated it so lightly and superficially as he has done, and should have propounded a paradoxical novelty with scarcely any ground to support it but his own naked assertion.

Mr. Freeman believes that the controversy first arose in the eleventh century, and not, as is generally supposed, in the ninth. His proposition is this: "It is commonly represented that controversy concerning the Eucharist commenced early in the ninth century; Paschasius Radbertus (in 820) on the one hand, and Ratramnus, Rabanus Maurus and others (840—850) on the other, having maintained diametrically opposite

views upon the subject. But in truth, on a careful examination of their writings, no such opposition can be discovered. That the writers no where impugn each other by name, is confessed. And the views maintained by them respectively prove on inquiry to be no more than the carrying out of one or the other term of the Eucharistic mystery, as anciently held. On neither side is this accompanied by a denial of the other term."

This is an assertion which must startle those who are even moderately conversant with the literature of the subject, and still more those who are in some degree at home in the circle of the Eucharistic ideas belonging to the period in question. If Mr. Freeman has been brought to his conclusion by a more "careful examination of the writings" to which he refers, than had been instituted by any of those who have gone before him, it is much to be lamented that he should not have thought it worth while to communicate the process as well as the result, instead of requiring his readers to take so important a point upon his sole authority, supported only by such very slight and worthless arguments as those which he has actually produced in the few pages which he has devoted to this part of his inquiry.

My own examination of the writings of Paschasius and Ratramn has led me to the opposite conclusion. I believe that it may be clearly shown from them, that the two lines of thought which Mr Freeman represents as parallel, do in fact run directly counter to one another; that the doctrine of Paschasius differs from Transubstantiation in little more than the name: only falling short of the last stage of its development: while that of Ratramn is the genuine doctrine of the Church of England, as opposed both to the Romish Transubstantiation and the Lutheran Co-subsistence.

Mr. Freeman believes his position to be strengthened by some external evidence, which may therefore deserve a preliminary remark. But I need only express my surprise, that he should for this purpose have seriously referred to the gross blunder by which Paschasius and Ratramn have been confounded with one another (p. 39). Whether there is any such identity (ibid.) in their language as to prevent any one who has carefully examined their writings from perceiving that their opinions are irreconcilably repugnant to each other, will be considered presently. But no doubt the "further and more convincing indication" of the alleged agreement which, as Mr. Freeman conceives, "is furnished by the silence of the Church at the time and for a long while after," is entitled to more attention; though, even if no other account could be given of it, its force as an argument would entirely depend on our ignorance of circumstances which might have enabled us to explain it. But it does not seem difficult to account for the fact otherwise. The gross carnal view maintained by Paschasius, was no doubt prevalent

among the vulgar, whose belief was confirmed by such miracles as those which he reports in his treatise, c. 14. But it is evident from the questions proposed by King Charles to Ratramnus, as well as from his answer, that it was not yet generally received even among the more intelligent Laity, still less among the more learned of the Clergy. Even two centuries later, Hildebrand would fain have eluded the necessity of sanctioning it by the condemnation of Berengar. But by that time the tide had become too strong even for him. In the earlier period, the Popes were still able to preserve a discreet neutrality: the rather as Ratramn appears to have destined his treatise for the private reading of Charles the Bald, avoided all personal allusion to Paschasius, who was his abbot at Corbey, and—conscious no doubt that he was on the unpopular side—shrank from publicity (see Lauf in the Stud. and Krit. 1828, p. 775). All this however is, as much as Mr. Freeman's inference from the "silence of the Church," matter of surmise, which ought not of itself to appear "convincing" to any one. The main question is, whether these two writers have expressed themselves so obscurely and ambiguously, that it is impossible to ascertain their meaning from their own language. And first, as to Paschasius.

Mr. Freeman (p. 36) denies that "Paschasius affirmed the annihilation of the elements in their proper nature." He acknowledges that the contrary "opinion has very widely prevailed:" but among the authors who have held it, he only notices the most ancient and the most modern: Berengarius and Dean Milman. Both, he thinks, were mistaken, and Dean Milman "probably misled by the authority of Berengarius:" who "overstates the view of Paschasius." On this I must observe that, if Dean Milman deferred to the authority of Berengarius, he acted both modestly and wisely, and as became a writer of Ecclesiastical History. For Berengarius was, by his familiarity with the mediæval language and trains of thought, incomparably better qualified to understand the meaning of Paschasius than any scholar at this day, and could be under no temptation needlessly to rank so eminent a person among his opponents. Mr. Freeman's assertion, that the doctrine which Berengarius attributes to Paschasius, "does not appear in his regular treatise on the subject," is just the point which we have to examine, and on which I believe Mr. Freeman to have been "misled," in opposition to the highest authority, by his preconceived theory. He also thinks that on this point he has Bishop Cosin on his side. And, indeed, the Bishop ventured to assert (Hist. of Trans. p. 117) that "in that whole book of Paschasius there is nothing that favours the transubstantiation of the bread, or its destruction or removal:" and that "he hath many things repugnant to transubstantiation." And of these things he gives several specimens. But if his extracts proved any thing, they would prove a great deal too much for the purpose: namely,

that transubstantiation is not now a doctrine of the Church of Rome. For all turns upon the words *spiritual* and *spiritually*. But these are admitted by Bellarmine to be applicable to the presence of Christ's body in the Eucharist (De Eccl. i. c. 2, "Non habet Christus in Eucharistia modum existendi corporum, sed potius spirituum, cum sit totus in qualibet parte. Itaque dicemus, Christum esse in Eucharistia vere, realiter, substantialiter, sed non dicemus corporaliter. Immo contra dici posset esse spiritualiter, ut Bernardus dicit in Sermone de S. Martino, ubi affirmat in Sacramento exhiberi nobis veram carnis substantiam, sed spiritualiter, non carnaliter: tamen non videtur hæc vox multum frequentanda, quia periculum esset ne traheretur ab adversariis non tam ad modum quam ad ipsam naturam significandam: propter quod item periculum non videtur valde usurpandum illud, *non esse corporaliter*, nisi addatur continuo explicatio"). From this we may judge of the value of the statement with which the Bishop sums up the import of his extracts: "In these he teacheth, that the mystery of the Lord's Supper is not, and ought not to be, understood carnally, but spiritually: and that this dream of corporal and oral transubstantiation was unknown to the ancient Church." Bishop Cosin also treats the chapter (14) which contains the legendary miracles as "a spurious interpolation," added "by the craft of some superstitious forger," though its intimate connection with the chapter immediately preceding, and the reference to the Jewish tradition about the manna, related in the third chapter, seem sufficiently to prove its genuineness, which Mr. Freeman does not dispute, but considers these stories as "illustrations," "of themselves proving that he conceived Christ's body to be present under a veil and in a mystery."

Mr. Freeman bids his readers "see the Treatise De Corpore throughout" (note *d*, p. 37), but he has himself quoted only three very short passages. Of these the first is, as he admits, an "approach to a denial of the existence of the elements," and therefore, as far as it goes, makes not for, but against his opinion. The second he has, as I shall show, entirely misunderstood. And the third will be found equally unavailable for his purpose. As this is all he has produced, I will consider each of them successively before I proceed to the positive part of my proof.

The first had been quoted by the Oxford editor of Bishop Cosin's "History of Transubstantiation" (p. 116), with the remark, that "though nearly approaching, it hardly amounts to the Roman doctrine of Transubstantiation." Mr. Freeman says: "The nearest approach to a denial of the existence of the elements in Paschasius is in his first chapter, '*Licet figura panis et vini* maneat, hæc *nihil aliud* quam caro Christi et sanguis post consecrationem credenda sunt.' But this may well mean that the outward visible elements are really the Body and

Blood, and nothing else. And Ratramn himself says the same: 'Post mysticam consecrationem nec panis jam dicitur nec vinum, sed Christi corpus et sanguis.'" It may be as well to give the passage with a little of the context, according to the reading of Sirmondus in the Paris edition of 1618. After some general statements on the Divine omnipotence, Paschasius proceeds: "Et ideo nullus moveatur de hoc corpore Christi et sanguine, quod in mysterio vera sit caro et verus sanguis: dum sic ille voluit qui creavit. Omnia enim quæcumque voluit Dominus fecit, in cœlo et in terra. Et quia voluit, licet in figura panis et vini hæc sic esse [l. licet in figura panis et vini, hæc esse], omnino nihil aliud quam caro Christi et sanguis post consecrationem credenda sunt." The Oxford editor, who reads "licet figura panis et vini hic sit," prints *credenda* in italics, apparently intending to suggest, that Paschasius might mean that the bread and wine became the Body and Blood only to the apprehension of faith. But when Mr. Freeman asserts that *nihil aliud* in this passage may "well mean" *nothing less*, he is bound, I think, at least to show that such an interpretation is warranted by the usage of the period, and was that which would be likely to occur to the minds of the readers of Paschasius. That such was not the case appears, as I think, very clearly from the following passage of Berengarius (De Sacra Cœna, Berolini, 1834, p. 109): "Omnis enim qui *nihil aliud* esse confirmat post consecrationem panis in altari, quam portiunculam carnis Christi, panem altaris per consecrationem absumi secundum subjecti corruptionem astruit, et si *nihil aliud* est in altari, nisi carnis Christi portiuncula sensualis, non mentitur, qui dicit, post absumptum sensualiter panem esse solummodo corpus Christi in altari." That is, in the opinion of Berengarius, Paschasius could not have used such language, unless he had meant to say that, after consecration, the elements ceased to exist in their proper nature. To him *nihil aliud* is the exact equivalent of *solummodo*. Whether, however, this is "the nearest approach to a denial of the existence of the elements in Paschasius," and whether "Ratramn himself says the same," we shall see presently.

In the second of the three passages Mr. Freeman has fallen into error for want of sufficient attention to his own direction: "See the Treatise De Corpore *throughout*." If he had not considered the words which he quotes by themselves, but in connexion with other parts of the treatise, he would have seen that they have an entirely different meaning from that which he attributes to them, and, in fact, imply exactly the reverse of it. "Paschasius," he says (p. 37, note *d*), "affirms, in clear contradiction to the doctrine which obtained in the eleventh century, that 'Christum fas vorari dentibus non est.'" The words occur in c. 4. And even the immediate context might have led him to doubt the soundness of his interpretation. It runs thus: "Utique et panis qui de cœlo

descendit verus panis. Sed quia Christum vorari fas dentibus non est, voluit in mysterio hunc panem et vinum vere carnem suam et sanguinem consecratione Spiritus Sancti potentialiter creari; creando vero quotidie pro mundi vita mystice immolari, ut sicut de virgine per Spiritum vera caro sine coitu creatur, ita per eundem ex substantia panis ac vini mystice idem Christi corpus et sanguis consecretur." No doubt, according to Paschasius, Christ may not be devoured with the teeth; but his real natural flesh may. And how this comes to pass is clearly explained in the twelfth chapter. He there shows that although Christ himself, having entered once for all into the heavenly places, remains there a High Priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec, his flesh possesses an inexhaustible productivity, through which, by the power of the Divine word, it may and does multiply itself. "Verbo enim Patris dictum est, *Crescite et multiplicamini*, et ecce adhuc hodie ex eo cuncta creantur animantia, non nova, sed ex eodem semine. Ita et caro Christi eodem verbo fit caro, quo Verbum caro factum est, et habitavit in nobis. Unde si ex illa benedictione tanta manat multitudo, quid putas ex carne Christi? Nunquid inefficax est ex se, qui tanta fecit ex nihilo? Et sicut panes auxit ex nihilo quantitate substantiæ, quam naturæ non dederat: nunquid impotens est facere ex aliquo, quod sine semine in utero creaverat? *Pullulat ergo illa ubertas carnis Christi, et manet integer Christus:* quia natura manente integra, etiam in creaturis ad jussum ejus cuncta exuberant. Propterea licet semel dixerit, *Germinet terra herbam virentem*, adhuc hodie ex eo quæ per singulos nascuntur annos omnia creantur. Sic utique et in eo quod semel voluit, et deinceps carnem et sanguinem in hac commemoratione jussit esse, fit quod jubetur." It is evident from this that, according to the view of Paschasius, although, or rather because, Christ himself remains for ever in heaven entire and untouched, his very natural flesh may be, and in the Eucharist always is, eaten upon earth; and therefore that the assertion, "Christum vorari fas dentibus non est," does not "contradict," but is perfectly consistent with "the doctrine which obtained in the eleventh century:" "Christi corpus sensualiter sacerdotum manibus tangi et frangi."

The third passage, also from c. 4, is quoted by Mr. Freeman as confirming his inference from that which has been just examined. "So again, 'Veram carnem et verum sanguinem, sed *mystice:* mysticum est sacramentum nec *figuram* illud negare possumus.' Ratramn himself could not say more." I am obliged to say, that this remark as to Ratramn is not only frivolous and irrelevant, but must mislead the reader who relies on Mr. Freeman's authority as to the nature of the question. Ratramn might certainly have used the same language, but he would have required that it should be understood in his own sense, and not in that of Paschasius. Neither Paschasius nor Ratramn has left room for any reasonable doubt as to the meaning which each of them

attached to the terms *veritas* and *figura* in the Eucharist. And I shall show that their views are so directly opposed to each other, that what to the one is the reality, is to the other the figure, and vice versâ. That there was something of *mystery* and *figure* in the Sacrament, followed from the nature of the thing, according to every account that could be given of it, and particularly from that of Paschasius himself in the preceding chapter, where he discusses the question: "*Quid sint sacramenta, vel quare dicantur.*" This therefore is quite independent of any particular speculation on the import of the mystery. It is common neutral ground, which may and must be taken by those who are most completely at variance with one another in their doctrine of the Sacraments. But it will be still more apparent how little the words quoted by Mr. Freeman can serve any purpose of his argument, when they are set down with the context which he has omitted. The passage from which they are extracted follows immediately after that which I have already transcribed, in which Paschasius affirms, as we have seen, that the same Body and Blood of Christ which were created from the Virgin through the Spirit, are through the same Spirit mystically consecrated (that is, formed by consecration) out of the substance of bread and wine. And he then proceeds with another quotation from our Lord's discourse at Capernaum: "De qua videlicet carne ac sanguine, *Amen, amen*, inquit, *dico vobis, nisi manducaveritis carnem filii hominis, et biberitis ejus sanguinem, non habebitis vitam æternam in vobis.* Ubi profecto non aliam quam veram carnem dicit, et verum sanguinem; licet mystice. Unde quia mysticum est Sacramentum, nec figuram illud negare possumus." That is, our Lord's words are to be taken literally, but yet not according to the error of the Capernaites, but with reference to the Sacrament, and therefore mystically and in a figure. How can it be gathered from this that Paschasius did not hold the annihilation of the elements? That he really did so, I shall now endeavour to prove; and by a method which will at least be admitted to be more satisfactory, and more likely to lead to the discovery of the truth, than that which has been adopted by Mr. Freeman. For I shall not, like him, content myself with two or three detached passages,—though those which I shall produce will, I trust, appear more to the point than any to which he has referred,—but shall endeavour to show that the doctrine in question is so involved in the whole argument of Paschasius, that several entire chapters of his treatise would be absurd and unintelligible on any other supposition.

I have already incidentally quoted some expressions which are, as I think, a much nearer "approach to a denial of the existence of the elements," than that which has been selected by Mr. Freeman as alone worthy of notice, where all depends on the literal sense of *nihil aliud*. Such are those in c. 4, where the Body and Blood are said to be created out of the substance of the bread and wine; or, in precisely the same sense,

the bread and wine are said to be created the Body and Blood by consecration through the power of the Holy Ghost. When we remember that this creation is repeatedly compared by Paschasius to the miracle of the Incarnation, it must be evident that in his system it implies the abolition of the substance out of which the new substance is formed. A little farther on in the same chapter, in his explanation of *veritas* as opposed to *figura* in the Sacrament, he varies his phrase, so as perhaps to make the meaning still clearer: "Veritas est, dum corpus Christi et sanguis virtute Spiritus in verbo ipsius ex panis vinique substantia efficitur." How could he have used such language, if he supposed the bread and wine to remain physically unchanged? But there are passages still stronger than these, where the change is expressly affirmed. One occurs (c. 2) in his mystical interpretation of a passage of Leviticus, where he says that the words (Levit. xxii. 14) signify one, "qui advertat omnem sanctificationem mystici sacrificii, et efficaciam, quomodo sensibilis res intelligibiliter virtute Dei per verbum Christi in carnem ipsius ac sanguinem divinitus *transferatur*." *Intelligibiliter*, because the change, though real, was not perceptible by the senses, but not the less implying that the elements which underwent the change ceased to exist in their proper nature. Again (c. 8), "Cogita igitur si quidpiam corporeum potest esse sublimius, cum substantia panis et vini in Christi carnem et sanguinem efficaciter interius commutatur, ita ut deinceps post consecrationem vera Christi caro et sanguis veraciter credatur et non aliud quam Christus panis de cœlo a credentibus æstimetur." It seems hardly possible to "approach" nearer than this to "a denial of the existence of the elements," without the technical term transubstantiation which however could scarcely be defined better, than as that change by which "*substantia panis et vini in Christi carnem et sanguinem commutatur*."

I proceed to that which I consider as the more cogent, if I may not say the absolutely conclusive and irresistible proof of my position. Mr. Freeman thinks that "the immediate design of the treatise of Paschasius was" only "to affirm that the Body and Blood which our Lord meant when He instituted the Eucharist, were no other than those which He gave for our redemption on the cross," but that, although "his language to this effect is strong, with a tendency towards the merely physical," "he confines himself to the positive statement of that side of the mystery with which he is dealing," and does not mean to reject the other, "by denying the existence of the material elements" after consecration. But to one who reads the treatise with this notion of the author's doctrine, how strange must appear the heading of the thirteenth chapter: "Ut quid hæc colorem et saporem in Sacramento minime permutant," the inquiry why the elements undergo no change in colour or taste. Surely, if they remained in "their proper nature," the wonder would be if they did not retain their sensible qualities. And when we look into the con-

tents of the chapter, we find that the object for which this was so ordained is stated to be twofold: to conceal the mystery from the profane gaze of unbelievers; and to enhance the merit of faith, and quicken the longings of the faithful for the full manifestation, and eternal fruition of Christ: "ita ut et veritas non desit in Sacramento, et ridiculum nullum fiat paganis, quod cruorem occisi hominis bibamus. Avidius enim requiritur quod latet, et preciosius est, quod cum fide quæritur. Ideo quoque sic debuit hoc mysterium temperari, ut et arcana secretorum celarentur infidis, et meritum cresceret de virtute fidei, et nihil deesset interius vere credentibus promissæ veritatis. Insuper et quod majus est, per hæc secretius præstita ad illam tenderent speciem satietatis, ubi jam non pro peccatis nostris quotidie Christus immolabitur, sed satietate manifestationis ejus sine ulla corruptione omnes sine fine fruemur." The end of concealment would indeed be equally attained, whether the elements did or did not continue to exist in their proper nature, so long as they presented the same sensible appearance. But it could be no trial of faith, that bread and wine looked and tasted like bread and wine, and not like flesh and blood. On the contrary, it would have been a stupendous miracle if they had done so. But if, as we have seen Paschasius repeatedly affirming to be the fact, the substance of the bread and wine had been changed into the real flesh and blood of Christ, then it was very natural to inquire why the change went no farther, and left the outward appearance, the colour and taste, of the transmuted elements unaltered? And this it is the object of the chapter to explain.

The same thing appears even more plainly from the sixteenth chapter, in which Paschasius discusses another question, which must sound very strange to one who takes Mr. Freeman's view of the subject. For it is, whether this body after consecration may be rightly called bread. "Utrum hoc corpus post consecrationem panis jure queat vocari." It is clear from the terms of the question, that Paschasius did not conceive more than one substance to be present in the Sacrament of the Body, namely, the very Flesh of Christ. If he had believed that bread existed along with it, it would have been needless to raise such a question, as there would have been no difficulty to be solved. But if the bread had ceased to exist, there was good reason to inquire, whether the Body which had been created in its room, could be rightly called by the same name. But at all events, according to Mr. Freeman's view, the answer to such a question should have been an explanation of the distinction between the two co-existing substances, and of the synecdoche by which both together might be properly described by the name of either. But how totally different from this is the answer which Paschasius really gives! He starts from the fact that the name of *bread* is actually given to the Sacrament by St. Paul, and then proceeds to show in what sense

this is to be understood; and it is, not as Mr. Freeman would have said, because the existence of the bread is "one side of the mystery," but because the Flesh of Christ is itself the living Bread which came down from heaven. And he goes on to say, that the Blood may in like manner be figuratively (typicè) called wine; not because there is really wine in the cup, but because it is the property of wine to gladden the heart of man. "Quod panis etiam, quamvis vera caro sit, hoc mysterium possit nominari, probat Apostolus ubi dicit, *Probet se homo, et sic de pane illo edat et de calice bibat*, quia Christi caro et vera caro, et tamen panis vivus qui de cœlo descendit jure catholice prædicatur. Caro quidem secundum gratiam, panis vero secundum efficientiam, quia sicut hic panis terrenus vitam subministrat temporalem, ita ille cœlestis vitam præstat æternam et cœlestem, quia vita est sempiterna. Denique et sanguis hic secundum efficientiam, simili modo vinum typicè potest vocari: quia sicut vinum lætificat cor hominum sobrie potatum, ita longe locupletius hoc vinum sanguinis lætificat cor hominis interioris et inebriat mentem amore spiritali." If there could be a shadow of doubt about the meaning of this language, it would be removed by the fact, that the view here expounded is precisely that of Humbert and Lanfranc. Lanfranc, De Corpore et Sanguine Domini, c. 8: "Confitetur Ecclesia toto orbe terrarum diffusa, panem et vinum ad sacrandum proponi in altari: sed inter sacrandum incomprehensibiliter et ineffabiliter in substantiam carnis et sanguinis commutari. Non tamen panem negat, immo confirmat. Sed panem qui de cœlo descendit, et dat vitam mundo: . . . . Vinum quoque non qualecunque, sed quod hominum, non quidem omnium, sed servorum Dei corda lætificat, quod animas inebriat, et a peccatis purgat." To which Berengarius replies (p. 113 and foll. of the Berlin edition; compare especially p. 125): "Illud insistendum, quod vere beatus Ambrosius in eo libello sentiat, non deesse secundum sua subjecta mensæ dominicæ *non panem qui de cœlo descendit quod dicitur tropice corpus Christi*, quo tu sophistice contendis elabi, sed panem, qui de pistrino venit ad communem aut dominicam mensam, qui propria locutione dicitur panis non tropica, *et non vinum qui lætificat cor, quod dicitur Christi sanguis similiter locutione tropica*, sed vinum quod non tropica locutione dicitur vinum, quod de torculari ad communem paratur vel ad dominicum calicem." It was, in the opinion of Berengarius, a sophistical evasion of a difficulty which pressed on the doctrine of Transubstantiation.

Mr. Freeman deals with Ratramn in the same easy, but very unsafe and unsatisfactory way as with Paschasius; citing a very few passages, or rather phrases, ambiguous in themselves, and detached from the context, which can alone determine their precise meaning. And he is so unfortunate, even in this very scanty selection, that two of his extracts are taken from a chapter (28) which contains, as we shall see, one of

the clearest illustrations of that "direct contrariety and incompatibility" which he denies to exist between the views of Paschasius and Ratramn. But I believe that he has not only failed to produce any sufficient evidence of his assertion, but has misapprehended the state of the question as proposed by Ratramn, the general drift of his argument, and the master thought of the treatise. He says first: "The treatise of Ratramn however proves that there were some at that time who represented that the Body and Blood of Christ in the Eucharist were discernible by the senses." If so, the darkness of "that time" must have been grosser than it had ever before entered into the mind of any one, however disposed to look down with contempt on the mediæval intellect, to imagine. But Mr. Freeman only makes this statement to withdraw it in the next sentence, and he shows in the same paragraph, that the treatise not only does not "prove" this, but proves that it was impossible; for, as he truly observes, "Ratramnus appeals to the evidence of the senses as decisive, *by universal admission*, of the reality of the elements;" that is, of their sensible properties, form, colour, taste, and smell (c. 9 and 10, "exterius quidem panis, quod ante fuerat, forma prætenditur, color ostenditur, sapor accipitur. Gusta, vinum sapit: odora, vinum redolet: inspice, vini color intuetur. . . . Hæc ita esse nemo potest abnegare"). "But," Mr. Freeman proceeds, "they seem to have dreamed not so much of the natural Body and Blood being exhibited in their natural condition, as of a new Body and Blood, consisting of bread—a 'corpus panaceum'—and wine; so that there was no veiling or mystery, no outward and inward part." The "dream" therefore, instead of being, as would have appeared from the preceding sentence, a mere hallucination, was the opinion, that the bread and wine remained after consecration physically unchanged, but nevertheless became, in some sense, the Body and Blood of Christ; an opinion, which so far from being gainsayed by the treatise, was the belief of Ratramn himself, and is that of the Church of England. But when Mr. Freeman adds, "so that there was no veiling or mystery, no outward or inward part," this is quite another thing; not a necessary consequence of that opinion, but a proposition which both Ratramn and the Church of England utterly deny.

All this can only serve to divert attention from the real object of the treatise, which is at the same time to answer the two questions proposed by the King, and to refute the two propositions advanced by Paschasius at the outset of his work, to which those questions manifestly refer. Paschasius had affirmed (c. 1), "Quia voluit, licet in figura panis et vini, hæc sic esse, omnino nihil aliud quam caro Christi et sanguis post consecrationem credenda sunt. Unde ipsa Veritas ad discipulos *Hæc*, inquit, *caro mea est pro mundi vita*." This, with the subsequent fuller and more definite statements to the same effect, several of which have

been already cited, suggested the first of the two questions, which is thus stated by Ratramn (c. 5): "Quod in Ecclesia ore fidelium sumitur Corpus et Sanguis Christi, quærit Vestræ Magnitudinis Excellentia, in mysterio fiat an in veritate." I pass over, for the present, the farther explanation of the question, introduced by *id est*, which unfortunately is so worded as itself to stand in great need of elucidation. Paschasius proceeds: "Et, ut mirabilius loquar, non alia plane quam quæ nata est de Maria, et passa in cruce, et resurrexit de sepulchro." This raises the second question, thus stated by Ratramn: "et utrum ipsum Corpus sit, quod de Maria natum est, et passum, mortuum, et sepultum, quodque resurgens et cœlos ascendens, ad dexteram Patris consideat."

The explanation of the first question, subjoined to the *id est*, runs thus: "Utrum aliquid secreti contineat quod oculis solummodo fidei pateat: an sine cujuscunque velatione mysterii hoc aspectus intueatur corporis exterius, quod mentis visus aspiciat interius, ut totum, quod agitur, in manifestationis luce clarescat." I will just remark that the Oxford editor, whose translation is in general much better than that of Canon Hopkins, has not observed that *aspectus corporis* corresponds to *mentis visus*, and was correctly rendered by Hopkins, "bodily sight." But the whole paraphrase is no doubt very obscure, and can only be understood by reference to the definitions which follow of Figura and Veritas. With regard to these, Mr. Freeman observes (note *h*, p. 38) on the word *figuratè* in c. 10 ("claret quia panis illa vinumque *figuratè* Christi Corpus et Sanguis existit"), "He does not mean unreally or metaphorically, but under another, which he elsewhere calls a spiritual, manner of being. So he explains *figura* l. c." This reference is certainly candid, almost to naïveté. For when we turn to Ratramn's definitions of *figura* and *veritas*, we find that, so far from confirming Mr. Freeman's assertion, they relate entirely to the distinction between metaphorical and literal language. "Figura," he says (c. 7) "est obumbratio quædam, quibusdam velaminibus quod intendit ostendens." So far he might be speaking either of a type or a metaphor. But what follows makes it unmistakably evident that he means a *figure of speech*. "Verbi gratia, Verbum volentes *dicere* Panem *nuncupamus:* sicut in oratione Dominica 'panem quotidianum dari nobis' expostulamus; vel cum Christus in Evangelio *loquitur dicens*, 'Ego sum Panis vivus, qui de cœlo descendit,' vel cum Seipsum Vitem, discipulos autem Palmites *appellat*. 'Ego sum,' *dicens*, 'Vitis vera, vos autem Palmites;' hæc enim omnia *aliud dicunt* et *aliud innuunt*." This is the explanation which Mr. Freeman considers as a proof, that by *figuratè* Ratramn "does not mean metaphorically," but "under another manner of being." And in perfect conformity with this is the explanation of *veritas*. "Veritas vero est rei manifestæ demonstratio, nullis umbrarum imaginibus obvelatæ, sed puris et apertis, utque planius eloquamur,

naturalibus significationibus insinuatæ." Here again, so far, the meaning is undetermined; but what follows shows that the author is speaking of *language:* for he goes on: "utpote cum *dicitur* Christus natus de Virgine, passus, crucifixus, mortuus et sepultus; nihil enim hic *figuris* obvelantibus adumbratur, verum rei veritas naturalium significationibus *verborum* ostenditur, neque *aliud hic licet intelligi quam dicitur.* At in superioribus non ita; nam substantialiter nec Panis Christus, nec Vitis Christus, nec Palmites Apostoli. Quapropter hic Figura, superius vero Veritas in narratione monstratur, id est, nuda et aperta significatio."

I have transcribed these two definitions in full, that the reader may compare them with the terms in which Ratramn states the first of the two questions. And I think it must now be clear what is the real import of that long circumlocution with which he explains what he meant by *in mysterio fiat an in veritate.* The question was, whether the expression *Corpus et Sanguis Christi* was to be understood literally or figuratively. Paschasius had maintained the literal interpretation of the words, and consequently the natural reality of the Body and Blood created out of the substance of the bread and wine. Ratramn contends for the figurative interpretation, according to which the bread and wine undergo no other than a relative change, becoming the Body and Blood only in spiritual significance and efficacy. The contrast between the two views which Mr. Freeman represents as harmonizing with one another, is as complete as can well be conceived. To Paschasius the Sacrament is, *in veritate,* in the literal sense of the words, the Body and Blood of Christ: figuratively, it is bread and wine. To Ratramn, on the contrary, it is bread and wine *in veritate,* the Body and Blood, figuratè.

But Mr. Freeman has cited (note *h*, p. 38) three passages, one from c. 9, two from c. 28, as containing "clear expressions, which are as strong as any thing Paschasius says," by which we must judge of Ratramn's meaning when he speaks of the bread as "the figure of Christ's Body, and the like expressions." The passages are: "Panis per sacerdotis ministerium Christi corpus conficitur c. 9. Non enim putamus ullum fidelium dubitare, panem illum fuisse Christi corpus effectum:" and "Panis substantiam et vini creaturam convertere potuit in proprium corpus." It is only fair to Mr. Freeman to remark, that the Magdeburg Centuriators were also struck by Ratramn's use of the term *convertere,* and observed (as they are triumphantly quoted by D'Achery, Spic. i. p. 52), "Transubstantiationis habet semina Bertramus, utitur enim vocabulis *commutationis* et *conversionis.*" On the other hand, it might have occurred to him to reflect, that if there was any force in this expression apart from the context, it would prove that Berengarius also perfectly agreed with Lanfranc. For he says (p. 161, ed. Berolin.), "Est vera procul dubio panis et vini per consecrationem altaris conversio

in corpus Christi et sanguinem:" which, if we look no farther, is surely as "clear" and "as strong as any thing" Lanfranc says, being, in fact, an echo of his words. But then Berengarius proceeds to distinguish: "Sed attendendum, quod dicitur per consecrationem, quia hic est hujus conversionis modus:" that is, as he explains by numerous examples in the context, a purely relative change. And therefore it is equally necessary to look a little farther in Ratramn's context before we can be sure whether he means the same kind of change as Paschasius. And the context is this: "Sicut ergo paulo antequam pateretur, panis substantiam, et vini creaturam convertere potuit in proprium Corpus quod passurum erat, et in Suum Sanguinem, qui post fundendus extabat, sic etiam in deserto manna et aquam de petra in Suam Carnem et Sanguinem convertere prævaluit, quamvis longe post et Caro Illius pro nobis in cruce pendenda, et Sanguis Ejus in ablutionem nostram fundendus superabat." So that it turns out that the change signified by this "clear and strong expression" is no other than that which took place (according to Ratramn's interpretation of St. Paul's language, 1 Cor. x. 1—4, which he has been expounding in several preceding chapters) in the manna and water, by which they were made the vehicles of spiritual nourishment. And he describes this nourishment still more plainly in c. 26, where, commenting on the words of the Psalm lxxviii. 25, "Panem angelorum manducavit homo," he says, "ostendit certe Psalmista, quid patres nostri in illo manna cœlesti perceperint, vel quid fideles in mysterio Christi credere debeant. In utroque certe Christus innuitur, qui et credentium animas pascit, et Angelorum cibus existit. Utrumque hoc non corporeo gustu, nec corporali sagina, sed spiritualis Verbi virtute." Paschasius took a totally different view of this subject, which he explains in the fifth chapter of his treatise. He considered the manna as a type of the Sacrament: "Manna spiritualiter percipientibus typus fuit escæ corporis Christi, et aqua illa quæ de petra fluxerat figura sanguinis. Siquidem in præfiguratione idem, sed non idem in adimpletione veritatis." Here again, we see, that what to the one was *figura*, was to the other *veritas*. Ratramn again illustrates his view of the subject by reference to Baptism. Consecration effects no other kind of change in the bread and wine of the Eucharist than in the water of the Font (c. 17—19). In each case the material element becomes the vehicle of a spiritual power ("spiritualis potentia," c. 21). This power or virtue he is constantly insisting upon, as that by which alone the Sacrament differs from the unconsecrated elements. And this is the doctrine against which Paschasius vehemently protests in his Commentary on S. Matthew (c. xxvi.) and his Letter to Frudegard, and with an evident reference to Ratramn's treatise: "Miror quid velint nunc quidam dicere, non in re esse veritatem carnis Christi vel sanguinis, sed in Sacramento *virtutem* quandam carnis, et non carnem, *virtutem* sanguinis et non sanguinem; *figuram et*

non veritatem, umbram et non corpus." A direct antithesis to the proposition with which Ratramn sums up his answer to the first question, c. 49: "Corpus et Sanguis Christi quæ fidelium ore in Ecclesia percipiuntur, figuræ sunt secundum speciem visibilem. At vero secundum invisibilem substantiam, id est, divini *potentiam* Verbi, vere Corpus et Sanguis Christi existunt. Unde secundum visibilem creaturam corpus pascunt, juxta vero potentioris *virtutem* substantiæ, fidelium mentes et pascunt et sanctificant."

With regard to the second question, Mr. Freeman admits that "there is at first sight a clear opposition" between Paschasius and Ratramn, "the one asserting that the Body received in the Eucharist is the same which Christ had on earth, and gave for our redemption; the other, that it is not. But when they come to explain themselves, they clearly show that what they both alike believed was a different mode of manifestation or existence of the same Body." I believe they have explained themselves clearly enough to prove that neither of them would have accepted the compromise by which Mr. Freeman seeks to reconcile them with one another. Neither of them held that there was more than one substance in the Sacrament. This was believed by Paschasius to be the very Body and Blood of Christ, though not manifested to the senses, but veiled under what were afterwards called the accidents of bread and wine. Ratramn, on the contrary, believed that the bread and wine remained after consecration without any change but the accession of a new spiritual efficacy, which he describes as the power of the Divine Word, which not only feeds but purifies the soul (c. 64): "Divini potentia Verbi quæ non solum animas pascit, verum etiam purgat." It is true Paschasius conceived the Flesh and Blood of Christ to be endued with a spiritual virtue, though still they could only profit those who eat and drink of them spiritually (c. 6); "Alius carnem Christi spiritualiter manducat et sanguinem bibit; alius vero non, quamvis buccellam de manu sacerdotis videatur percipere . . . non utique sibi carnem utiliter et sanguinem, sed judicium." But this does not bring his doctrine nearer to that of Ratramn, if it may not be said to widen the distance between them. But the question between them is as to the nature of the thing contained in the Sacrament, not, as Mr. Freeman represents, as to the "mode of its manifestation or existence." Paschasius asserted this thing to be the very natural Flesh and Blood of Christ; and hence he teaches that Christ now dwells in us, not merely by harmony of will, but by nature (c. 9, "non solum per concordiam voluntatis, sed per naturam"). For how, he asks, could it be otherwise? "Nam si Verbum caro factum est, et nos vere Verbum carnem in cibo dominico sumimus: quomodo Christus in nobis manere *naturaliter* jure non æstimatur, qui et naturam carnis nostræ inseparabilem sibi homo natus Deus assumpsit, et naturam carnis suæ ad naturam æternitatis sub

sacramento hoc nobis communicandæ carnis admiscuit?" Ratramn, on the other hand, denies that the bread and wine are the Body and Blood otherwise than as a *pledge* and an *image*. And, let it be carefully observed, not, as some would wish such language to be understood, a pledge and image of a thing *present*, but of a thing *absent* and to come: c. 86, "apparet quod hoc Corpus et Sanguis pignus et imago rei sunt *futuræ*." And c. 87, "Qua de re et Corpus Christi, et Sanguis est quod Ecclesia celebrat, sed tanquam imago. Veritas vero erit, cum jam nec pignus nec imago, sed ipsius rei veritas apparebit." It seems impossible to say that this is a difference of views which only relates to the "mode of manifestation or existence of the same Body:" as if both admitted the same body to be present, only in different modes: unless it might be truly said, that the whole difference between a portrait and its original consists in the "mode of manifestation or existence of the same" person.

The intrinsic importance of the difference is another matter, which cannot at all affect its nature or reality. And as Paschasius and Ratramn no doubt frequently communicated at the same altar, so, notwithstanding the wide divergency of their opinions, they may have done so with equal benefit to themselves. But the consequences of their dispute were not of slight moment, and are seen and felt at this day. Paschasius contributed more than any individual before Lanfranc to the preponderance of that belief which became the dogma of Transubstantiation. Ratramn's treatise, as is well known, exercised a most powerful influence on the mind of Ridley, and was thus mainly instrumental in fixing the doctrine of the Church of England on the Eucharist, or rather in restoring that of the Anglo-Saxon Church, as expounded, in exact conformity to the ideas, and partly in the very words of Ratramn, by Ælfric in the Paschal Homily, where he teaches: "This mystery is a pledge and a symbol; Christ's body is truth. This pledge we hold mystically, until we come to the truth, and then will this pledge be ended" (Mr. Thorpe's translation, vol. ii. p, 274, in the publication of the Ælfric Society). Most justly therefore did Canon Hopkins observe (in the Dissertation prefixed to his edition of the Treatise, ed. 1688, ch. v p. 105) that "the doctrine of Ratramn was the very same doctrine which the Church of England embraced as most consonant to Scripture and the Fathers. Which is not what our adversaries would put upon us, that the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper is a naked Commemoration of our Saviour's Death, and a mere Sign of his Body and Blood, but an efficacious Mystery, accompanied with such a Divine and Spiritual Power, as renders the consecrated Elements truly, tho' Mystically, Christ's Body and Blood, and communicates to us the real Fruits, and saving Benefits of his bitter Passion And this is the Doctrine of Bertram, in both parts of his work."

Mr. Freeman also asserts—though with an appearance of some misgiving—that before the eleventh century, "no writer perhaps came forward to vindicate in a special manner that (side of the mystery) which had been selected by Paschasius." This supposed silence would indeed be favourable to Mr. Freeman's hypothesis. But the fact is far otherwise. The views of Paschasius were strenuously enforced by several eminent writers of the ninth and tenth centuries. Hincmar, in his twelfth Letter to Charles the Bald, asks (tom. ii. p. 100, ed. Par. 1645): "Si valuit sermo Heliæ ut ignem de cœlo deponeret, non valebit Christi sermo, ut species mutet elementorum? Sermo Christi qui potuit ex nihilo facere quod non erat, non potuit quæ sunt in id mutare quod non erant? Non enim minus est, novas dare res, quam mutare naturas." Haimo (in D'Achery, Spic. ed. ii. 1, p. 42), "Credimus et fideliter confitemur et tenemus quod per operationem divinæ virtutis, natura panis et vini substantialiter convertantur in aliam substantiam, id est, in carnem et sanguinem . . . In quo quidem Christi corpore et sanguine, propter sumentium honorem, sapor panis et vini remanet et figura, substantiarum natura in Corpus Christi et Sanguinem omnino conversa." Ratherius of Verona (ibid. p. 376), "Crede, frater, quia sicut in Cana Galilææ vinum Dei imperio verum et non figurativum fuit ex aqua factum, ita istud Dei benedictione vinum verus et non figurativus efficitur sanguis, et caro panis." And he goes on to compare this change to that by which at the creation the dust of the earth, though its substance remained, was transfigured into human flesh. "Ita ergo et hic manente colore, atque sapore, eadem sapientia operante, veram carnem et sanguinem quod percipis esse crede; sicut e contra mutata hominis specie hominis creatione, limi tamen substantiam manere non diffiteris." But he discourages any curious speculations as to the precise mode of the change, as, "si panis forsitan invisibiliter sublatus, aut ipse panis in carnem mutatus." No exegetical artifices, I think, can reconcile the doctrine laid down in these passages with that of Ratramn.

But widely as Ratramn differs from Paschasius, I believe they would have agreed in rejecting Mr. Freeman's view, as far more at variance with both of theirs, than either of them with the other. Mr. Freeman's "account" of that which takes place in the Eucharist is this (p. 154): "The natural body of Christ once slain, and no longer to be accounted as Christ by reason of the separation of It from his Human Soul, was nevertheless, after being duly received into the receptacle of God's appointing, the heart of the Earth, re-united to That Soul by the operation of the interposed Divinity; and so CHRIST HIMSELF was once more truly alive, and rose again. And even so, when His Body and Blood, existing in a new and specially provided manner, have been received into the duly qualified bodies and souls of men, does the same vital re-union, as it should seem, take place, and so CHRIST HIMSELF, in

Body, Soul and Divinity, is in them of truth, and raises them, together with Himself, to a glorious immortality."

I lament to see such a hypothesis proposed in a work which is in any way entitled to respectful notice. It may be said that it is a harmless speculation, which, however new, singular, and fantastical, does not exceed the bounds of that liberty which the Church allows. It may be so. But I cannot regard the diffusion of such a speculation as harmless. It must tend to infect the Church with a false unhealthy mysticism, which, as far as it spreads, will corrupt the character of her theology, weaken and pervert the minds which may be leavened with it, destroy their faculty of sober judgment, and prepare them for the reception of the wildest dreams that may spring up in disordered brains, as "high Catholic teaching."

VII.

A CHARGE

DELIVERED OCTOBER, 1860.

CHURCH RATES.—ENDOWED SCHOOLS BILL.—REVISION OF THE LITURGY.

MY REVEREND BRETHREN,

THE period which has elapsed since our last meeting has not been marked by any occurrences sensibly affecting the interests of our Church. Elsewhere, indeed, events have come to pass which will probably occupy a prominent place in ecclesiastical history. And, as Churchmen, we cannot look with indifference on the changes which have recently taken place in the condition and prospects of the Papacy with regard to its temporal dominion. It is perhaps more than a remarkable coincidence, that the violent shock which it has suffered in this respect should have followed so close on that unprecedented strain of its spiritual authority, by which a new dogma was added to its articles of faith, and which, as is well known, was mainly designed to propitiate the Divine favour with a view to secure it against this very danger. It is further noticeable, that while on the one hand the secular sovereignty has been represented as indispensable for the free administration of the spiritual office, on the other hand, the experience of a long course of ages appears to indicate that the abuses which have rendered that sovereignty intolerable to its subjects, are not mere casual incidents of its administration, but inseparable from its very constitution; and such is the conviction which prevails in the country where it has been exercised, among the most

intelligent of those who are familiar with its working. It is clear that henceforth its maintenance must depend entirely on physical force, perpetually aggravating the evil it upholds. And while the sword which Peter was enjoined to put up into its sheath has been wielded unsparingly, yet ineffectually, for this end, the spiritual weapon, which was once so much the more formidable, now, brandished with an unsteady hand, in the consciousness of impotence, appears utterly to have lost its edge, and excites only the contempt of those whom it is intended to overawe.

Position of the Papacy.

It may be hardly possible that so false a position should be long kept, or that such a power should be able permanently to rest on such a basis; and we may therefore be disposed to look forward to the issue with a confident hope. But we should be exposing ourselves to great risk of disappointment if we supposed that the interests of religion are sure to be promoted by the success of that which we may regard as the righteous cause. The establishment of civil freedom may come too late to heal the wound which has been inflicted on Christianity by its long alliance with the grossest social abuses. The removal of those restraints on the rights of conscience which at one time alone prevented the Reformation from taking root and spreading in Italy, would now, it is to be feared, be more frequently attended by the avowal of a blank and dreary infidelity, than by the profession of a purer faith. It is also quite possible that the friends of the Papacy may turn out to have been as much mistaken in their fears as its adversaries in their hopes. It remains to be seen whether it will lose anything in spiritual power and influence by the downfall of its secular dominion. It seems quite as probable that such a reverse may only urge it to more energetic and persevering efforts to extend its spiritual conquests by that system of proselytizing which we see carried on with unscrupulous activity around us. That the temporal humiliation will abate its pride, lower its pretensions, or soften its hostility toward any communion which refuses submission to its authority, is a result which we have little reason to expect, though we may fitly include it among the objects of our prayers.

But if we cast a glance at that which is passing at a distance, it is not because we have not enough to engage our attention at home. Though, as I have observed, the interval which has elapsed since my last Visitation has not been signalized by any very memorable occurrences touching the state of the Church, or by any peculiar agitation of theological controversy, and may therefore, on a superficial view, appear to have been on the whole calm and prosperous, it has been in an extraordinary degree one of very general uneasiness, arising from causes to which I need not here more specially refer, partly foreign and partly domestic. Thankfulness for deliverance from great dangers, and for the continued enjoyment of numberless blessings, has been well nigh stifled by anxiety for the future. A sense of insecurity, and a vague foreboding of indefinite change, has pervaded all classes of society, and certainly has been felt by none more deeply than by the friends of the Church. Questions of very grave moment, in their bearing on her welfare, and even on her stability as a National Church, have been debated in the Legislature; and though the issue has been so far satisfactory, that the danger which threatened us has been averted for the present, it has been under circumstances which compel us to look forward to the revival of these questions, and to the mooting of others perhaps still more critical, with no little anxiety. I will advert to some of them, not merely on account of their intrinsic importance, but because there are some features in their history from which I believe we may gather a profitable lesson.

Aspect of our Church.

I turn first to the Church-rate question.

It is now seven years since the law on this subject was left in its present state by the final decision in the Braintree case. By that decision—which reversed the successive judgments of two inferior courts of law—while the obligation of every parish to repair its church continued to be fully recognized, it was for the first time determined that no valid rate for that purpose could be made either by the Churchwardens, or by the minority of the parishioners assembled in vestry. After this, when a rate was refused by the majority, the only mode by which

Church-rates.

the acknowledged duty could be enforced was the institution of proceedings in the Ecclesiastical Court against individual recusants: a course attended with so much difficulty and risk of failure, and, it may be added, so generally obnoxious, as to be practically unavailable: nor does it appear that it has hitherto in any instance prevented or remedied the refusal of a rate. When the law had been thus settled, a very general apprehension I believe prevailed, that Church-rates would cease in a great number of parishes: and it was with a feeling of agreeable surprise, that the friends of the Church received the Returns from which it appeared that the proportion of such parishes to those in which the rate continued to be levied was very small.

There were two circumstances which might have prepared them to expect a different result. One was, that thenceforth the opposition to Church-rates was more and more fomented and organized by artificial means, chiefly through the agency of a Society, which has of late gained considerable notoriety under the imposing title, which describes it as instituted "For the Liberation of Religion from State Patronage and Controul." The other circumstance, which was so adverse to the continuance of Church-rates, that it might well have accounted for a successful resistance to them in a greater number of cases than actually occurred, is pointed out in the Report of the Select Committee appointed by the House of Lords "to inquire into the present operation of the law and practice respecting the assessment and the levy of Church-rates." The Report states: "That where a Church-rate has been refused, or has not been assessed, it has generally been attributable to one or other of the following causes; viz.—

Report of Committee of House of Lords.

"1st. The abuse of the rate, in its assessment for, and application to improper objects, or in excessive charges.

"2nd. The assessment of new parishes, and districts, having Churches of their own, to the rate of the Mother Church.

"3rd. The unwillingness of Churchwardens to propose a rate, the collection of which might be rendered difficult or impossible, by the uncertainty and inefficiency of the law.

"4th. Local causes of irritation unconnected with the rate."

To this enumeration the Report adds a fifth cause, which has often been treated as the only one: viz.—"The opinion entertained against Church-rates by certain classes of Dissenters on religious or political grounds." Let us observe by the way that the abuses above alluded to are admitted and deplored by all true friends of the Church; but that both these abuses, and "the uncertainty and inefficiency of the law," might be very easily remedied: while the "local causes of irritation" are indeed beyond the reach of legislative controul, but are mostly, if not everywhere, of a casual and temporary nature. And yet it is only with regard to those causes, which might be so easily removed, that there is any ground for the assertion, which was frequently repeated in the last Debate on the subject, as an argument for total and unconditional abolition of Church-rates: that they are an *acknowledged* evil or grievance. No such acknowledgment has been made in any other respect by those who desire to preserve them.

Abolition Bill passed in the Commons.

It is not very surprising that, under such circumstances, a measure for the total abolition of Church-rates, with a merely illusory semblance of a substitute, should have been carried in the House of Commons: and it was quite in the natural order of things, that, in a period of great political fluctuation, when elections followed one another at unusually short intervals, the majority should have gained strength.* Many are commonly ready to abandon a cause which

* The connexion between the increased frequency of elections and the progress of the opposition to Church-rates in Parliament, was pointed out with great naïveté by the noble lord who moved the second reading of the Church-rate Abolition Bill last session: "If it was desired to pass liberal measures through the House of Commons, the first and last sessions of a Parliament were the most auspicious periods. In 1859, when fresh from the hustings, honourable gentlemen were ready to vote for the abolition of Church-rates, but in 1860 their fervour had somewhat abated. Probably in 1861, 2, or 3, as the case might be, they would again vote against Church-rates before reappearing on the hustings." With this candid, but probably very just remark should be compared the evidence of Mr. Morley (842): "The particular Society (the Liberation Society) to which reference has been made, has correspondents in every constituency, and there is a degree of co-operation with them . . . in every constituency and in every moderately large town, and there is a course of action which candidates understand perfectly well, and which is found to be operative on this particular question."

is said to be doomed, and appears to be sinking. And though it was generally admitted that some compromise was desirable, those which were proposed had the less chance of success, as the stanchest friends of the Church were not agreed as to the principle or the extent of the concessions which it was right or expedient to make. But an unexpected reaction ensued: and the way in which it was brought about is not a little memorable and instructive. Churchmen had been roused by the rapid progress of the adverse movement, and, as they became better acquainted with the ulterior views of its authors, had begun to feel the necessity of exertion in self-defence. Associations were formed for the diffusion of information on the question, and for the promotion of petitions to Parliament. The evidence brought before the Committee of the House of Lords, made a great impression on the public mind. It appeared that the majorities by which the Abolition Bill had been passed in the House of Commons, did not really represent the sense of the country; and on the final division of last Session it went up to the Upper House to be discussed on its own merits, damaged rather than recommended by the very small majority of nine which carried it through the Lower, and met with the same fate as its predecessor.

Defeated in the Lords.

Another breathing time has thus been left to the Church, to consider her situation and prospects, by the light of her recent experience. We must be fully aware that it is nothing more than a breathing time. We have had ample warning, that the assault which has just been warded off will be renewed at the earliest opportunity with redoubled energy, stimulated by the mortification of repeated discomfiture; and the changes which are looming on the political horizon do not promise any accession of strength to our cause. The thing which appears to me most needed, is unanimity among Churchmen themselves. This, if complete, would I believe be sufficient for our security: and with regard to that which is at present the most important point—the simple extinction of the rate without substitute or compensation—every fresh ventilation of the question

Need of unanimity.

cannot, I think, but tend to promote general agreement in opinion, and consequently, it may be hoped, concert in action. The arguments by which it has been attempted to justify the unconditional abolition look best at a distance, and will certainly gain nothing from closer inspection. One, which had done not a little service in its day—the conscientious objection—appears to be nearly defunct. If it is entitled to any place, it should be put foremost; yet in the debate which decided the fate of the measure in the last Session, it was kept almost entirely out of sight. It is an argument which, if it has any real force, ought to have the greatest weight with Churchmen; and there are probably many who have been either convinced or perplexed by some or other of the forms in which it has been urged. One of the fallacies implied in it has been very often exposed, and, it is to be hoped, is now too generally perceived to produce much effect. It is quite clear that the case is not one in which there is any room for conscience to come into play. For this it cannot do, where there is no responsibility; and in the payment of a legal due there is none. If I acquire property subject to a deduction determined by the law on a certain contingency, as the vote of a majority, when the contingency has arisen, the portion of which I am thus divested is no longer mine; and my conscience can be no more affected by the purpose to which it is applied, however repugnant to my judgment and feelings, than by the use which my neighbour may make of his own. In such a case the sensitiveness of an enlightened conscience would be shown in the unwillingness which an honest man would feel, not to surrender, but to retain that which had ceased rightfully to belong to him.

Fallacy of conscientious objection.

Sometimes, indeed, it seems to be conceived, that there is a peculiarity in a tax imposed for religious purposes, which is a special violation of the rights of conscience. It is almost universally admitted, that no man can reasonably claim exemption from a war tax on the ground of a religious objection either to war in general, or to the particular war which gives occasion to the tax. But many, who acknowledge this, think

The argument pursued.

that a tax for the support of Divine Worship involves a religious principle, and thus affords a just ground for a conscientious scruple. It is said to be a grievance that any one should be compelled to contribute to the maintenance of a form of worship which is at variance with his religious convictions. This is sometimes expressed in terms which would be more appropriate if a building set apart for the worship of the Church of England was regarded by Dissenters in nearly the same light as a mosque or a synagogue. I need hardly say that this is a rhetorical exaggeration, which grossly misrepresents the views and feelings of the great mass of the nonconformists on the subject.* With regard to them, it is certain that the character of the worship for which the building is designed, does not enter into the question at all. We know that there is nothing in their religious principles which forbids them occasionally to join in our services, or to contribute voluntarily toward the maintenance or restoration of our sacred buildings. It is clear, therefore, that their objection to Church-rates is not pointed against the end, but simply against the means. It is not that the worship toward which they are compelled to contribute is one which shocks their religious feelings, but it is that the contribution is compulsory. It is grounded on a principle which would apply equally to their own form of worship. It is the same on which so many of them refused to accept any share of the Parliamentary

The Voluntary Principle.

* The sentiments of a very decided, but truly earnest, pious, and conscientious Dissenter, belonging to a body which is supposed to entertain the strongest prejudice against our Church, are expressed in Marshman's "Memoirs of Sir Henry Havelock," p. 40: "He (Havelock) stated in the memorial that, in conformity with the requirements of the articles of war, he had, when on duty with his own or any other regiment, invariably attended Divine Service according to the forms of the Church of England. He did not pretend that this constrained attendance had been in any respect painful to him, inasmuch as he admitted that he had been enabled, with very great delight and spiritual comfort, to join in the greater number of the prayers of the Liturgy of that Church; still he had felt it a hardship to be deprived of the privilege of assembling, at the hour best fitted for the purpose, with the members of his own Church, and of the benefit of attending the ministrations of his own minister; and to be constrained, on some occasions, to hear from the pulpit a condemnation of the principles which he revered." This last annoyance, it need hardly be observed, is one to which he would have been equally liable if he had been a Churchman, whether of the high or the low school.

grant for education. It is the so-called Voluntary Principle, which, if logically carried out, would undoubtedly lead to that severance of all connexion between Church and State which is the avowed object of the Liberation Society, in whose view the abolition of Church-rates is only important as a step toward that end. But it seems to me a sheer misnomer to call this a religious principle. It is a part of an abstract political theory with regard to the proper end and functions of the State. It is a tenet, not of any religious community, as such, but of a school; one which may, and does in fact, comprehend Churchmen along with Dissenters, while its doctrines are repudiated by very many Dissenters, especially those who adhere most faithfully to the teaching and practice of their spiritual forefathers, as strongly as by the vast majority of Churchmen.

But the argument which is now most insisted on, and by which many Churchmen appear to be most strongly impressed, is drawn from the irritation and heart-burnings caused by Church-rate contests. It has been thought a paradox to assert, that these occasional conflicts of opinion, on matters of common interest, are on the whole rather wholesome than hurtful. I believe there is more truth in that paradox than in the declamation to which it was opposed. But at least it seems strange that so much importance should be attached to the removal of this particular occasion of discord, in a country where so many are continually arising out of its free institutions, and are the indispensable condition of their existence. Purely political contentions are found to breed no less heat and bitterness; and Church-rate contests themselves, whenever they are unusually warm, are commonly connected with political rather than religious motives. But, however desirable it may be to put an end to strife, it does not seem quite reasonable to call on the party which has been for centuries in possession, to purchase peace by an absolute surrender of the matter in dispute. There have indeed been Conservative Churchmen who have consented to the unconditional abolition of Church-rates as "a settlement of the question." But if they were ready to pay the like price for peace as

Argument drawn from Church-rate contests.

often as an aggression is made on any part of the constitution in Church or State, it is evident that there would soon be nothing left to contend for. If indeed it was certain, or even probable, that this sacrifice is the last which would be required of us, and that it would insure the undisturbed possession of all that remained, that would be an advantage which could hardly be bought too dear. But we have had the fullest warning that such would not be the effect of the concession. The leaders of the movement have frankly proclaimed, that it would not so much as suspend their operations for a single day.* They are pledged never to rest so long as there remains a stone of a National Church which has not been thrown down. Even without such express notice we might have been sure that, when the long-contested position has been won, the assailants will not raise the siege, but, on the contrary, flushed with success, will the more vigorously attack the citadel. With such a prospect before us, to relinquish what we hold for the sake of quiet, would be suicidal infatuation.

This question settled, hostilities would not cease.

But we are sometimes met on a different ground. That which we are asked to resign is said to be, in a pecuniary point of view, so insignificant, as not to be worth a struggle to keep it. The whole amount levied by Church-rates, divided by the number of our parishes, gives only about 24*l.* for each parish: and we are taunted with betraying distrust of the energies of the Church, when we think it worth while to dispute about so paltry a sum, or doubt that it would be better applied, if it was transferred to the pockets of the landowners, who at present contribute liberally toward such objects. But the evidence before the Select Committee of the House of Lords, shows that the cessation of Church-rates has been severely felt even in towns, not only as involving the clergy in very distressing embarrassment, and subjecting them to demands upon their time which seriously interfere with the work of their ministry: but as threatening the

Effects of cessation of Church-rates.

* Mr. Morley (699): "That the settlement of the Church-rate question would meet the difficulties which Dissenters make I do not believe. I think you would find that the organizations which at present exist would remain so long as there existed any form of interference by legislation with religion." And Dr. Foster (1691).

continuance of any provision for the spiritual wants of the poor. In our rural parishes the effect would probably be in general still more disastrous. It must also be remembered, that a comparatively small sum laid out in time, may be sufficient for repairs, which, if delayed, will become very costly: and that the most wasteful of all systems is that of letting a house go to decay, until it requires to be taken down before it can be restored. We thankfully acknowledge the liberality displayed by many great landowners in their contributions toward our sacred edifices; and we do not suspect, with regard to any of them, that they are biassed in their view of this question by the prospect of any advantage which they would reap from a particular solution of it. But this will hardly warrant the expectation that the additional value which would be given to their property by the abolition of Church-rates, will be devoted to the same objects as the rate. Least of all, with our knowledge of that which has been accomplished by the voluntary efforts of Churchmen, can we doubt that they will prove equal to any emergency, or that the Church will ultimately adapt itself to any situation in which she may be placed by the will of Providence. But this confidence would not justify her in parting gratuitously with any temporal advantage which has been intrusted to her keeping, or wilfully encountering the manifold evils which are unavoidably incurred in a transition from a long established state of things to a new one. Many Churchmen regard all the other evils which would attend the abolition, as light in comparison with that of the dissolution of one of the ties by which the Church is knit to the State, and that weakening of the rest which they apprehend as its inevitable consequence; and in this view they undoubtedly agree with their most strenuous opponents who wish for the extinction of the rate on this very account.

Under these circumstances it seems to me clear what it is that the friends of the Church have most reason to desire. It is not, I think, the enforcement, even if it was practicable, of that which was, or was supposed to be, the law before the decision in the Braintree case, so as, in the parochial legislation on this subject,

to reverse the order of all other deliberative assemblies, and enable the minority to overrule the vote of the majority. But it is a commutation, on the principle recommended for consideration in the Report of the Select Committee, the assessment of the owner instead of the occupier, so as at once to render the rate less precarious, and to take away, or greatly diminish, the occasion of agitation and discord. Whether any other kind of settlement would be likely both to make effectual provision for the object, and to prove generally satisfactory, is a much more difficult question. The Committee have recommended that all persons who desire it may be exempted from contributing to the Church-rate, on giving yearly notice; but on condition that they shall not be entitled to vote upon the making or application of the rate. I must own that I think it much to be lamented, that such a proposal should have proceeded from such a quarter. In principle it appears to me undistinguishable from total abolition. For it is just as much equivalent to a declaration, that the Legislature no longer regards the maintenance of Divine Worship according to the rites of the National Church as a national benefit, to which therefore all are bound to contribute, but as something which may be left to the judgment or inclination of each individual. I am not indeed prepared to go to the same length with those who would entirely ignore all the changes which have taken place in the circumstances of our population since Church-rates were first established, and resist every relaxation of the general principle in favour of nonconformists. I cannot say, as has been said, that "I would much rather see the whole Church-rate extinguished, than attempts made to keep it nominally by any plan of exemption." I admit that no exemption ought to be conceded to any class of persons without some compensating benefit to the Church. But I cannot agree with those who hold that, as Churchmen, we have no right to deal with such a question, and are guilty of a breach of trust, if we consent to surrender any portion of the Church's claims on any terms. But this is not the point we have now to consider. The recommendation in the Report goes much farther. It was no

Commutation.

Proposal for exemption.

doubt because every scheme hitherto proposed for the exemption of nonconformists had failed—and always through their own opposition to it—that the Committee were induced to recommend this extension of the privilege to all who might choose to take advantage of it. This I think is a license which, while it makes a complete surrender of the principle, places the Church, in every respect, in a worse position. So far as I can see, it is likely not to abate, but rather to multiply and aggravate the evils which it is designed to remedy. Where opposition to Church-rates is strong, those who desire to see them abolished will hardly be tempted to withdraw from the conflict for the sake of a personal immunity, which they would equally gain, together with the far higher pleasure of victory, by a successful resistance. Where the rate has hitherto been levied with little or no opposition, the effect would probably be, to induce many to claim the exemption, who would never have desired it, if it had not been thus offered, and so to weaken the hands of those who wish to preserve the rate. It would in my opinion be far better than this, to retain the present system; only, if possible, with the other alterations of the law recommended by the Committee, for the correction of abuses, and the removal of impediments to the collection of the rate. The most fatal of all courses is that into which some, from whom we might have hoped better things, have been drawn: to consent to the unconditional abolition, as a step toward an adjustment to be afterwards devised. Such an exchange of substance for shadow will, I trust, commend itself to the judgment of few Churchmen who are free from the influences which beset statesmen in Parliament. Let us at least hold fast what we have, until something better is offered for our acceptance: and let us be assured that the more vigorously we show our resolution so to act, the better will be our prospect of a satisfactory compromise.

Its probable effects.

I have a good hope that the danger which threatens us may yet be averted. But it will not be by shutting our mouths, and folding our hands, and standing like unconcerned spectators of the course of events. This is a case in which we may and ought

to take a lesson from our adversaries. The so-called Liberation Society has both put us fairly on our guard, by an unreserved disclosure of its designs, and has shown us how they are to be counteracted. Though this Society has been at work for a considerable time, it is but recently, and only in connexion with the Church-rate question, that it has attracted a large share of public attention. Those who side with it on that question, without belonging to it, or even concurring with it in its ulterior objects, regret that it should have been brought so prominently forward, and are anxious to depreciate its importance. They would fain have it regarded as a knot of persons holding extreme opinions, in which they meet with very little sympathy from the public, and therefore incapable of exerting any material influence on the public mind. If, with regard to Church-rates, their efforts have not been ineffectual, that is attributed to the alleged fact, that they found public opinion on that subject to a great extent already with them, and had nothing to do but to call it forth into united action. I believe this to be a very imperfect and incorrect account of their proceedings. I cannot doubt that the Church-rate agitation has been not only fomented and directed, but to a great degree created by their agency. I believe that they have not only propagated their opinions on that head, but have impressed many with a belief in the general prevalence of those opinions, not warranted by the real state of the case. I am not speaking of this activity as matter for complaint, but rather as an example worthy of imitation. We have reason to be thankful for their frankness, and gladly accept their professions of goodwill, however we may differ from their judgment as to the mode in which it is displayed. For they assure us that they are labouring, if we did but know it, for our good. They believe that the abolition of Church-rates will be not an injury, but a benefit to the Church.* That would probably not be a very strong recom-

Liberation Society.

At the head of the Church-rate agitation.

* Report (768), Mr. S. Morley: "I am quite prepared to give the opinion that the Church would be the stronger for this step (the abolition of Church-rates). In fact, I believe that the more impediments of this kind are removed, the more likely would it be that Dissenters would join the Church." Afterwards, indeed, the same

mendation of their cause to Dissenters in general: and those who are least hostile, or in part positively friendly to the Church, are just the body which is the least favourable or generally adverse to the abolition: but it may have won some Churchmen to their side. All that strikes me as hard to understand, is how they can reconcile it to their consciences to do their utmost to strengthen an institution, which they condemn as unhallowed and pernicious, and avowedly wish to destroy. It would however be a mistake to suppose that no danger is to be apprehended from such a Society in the propagation of its more abstract doctrines because for the present they may have been embraced only by a few. It would not be the more difficult to gain converts to those doctrines, and even to render them the object of a passionate enthusiasm, because they are remote from common apprehension, and incapable of proof. There is no reason why multitudes, as great as those which have signed the petitions against Church-rates, should not be brought by like means to declare their conviction of the unlawfulness of all connection between Church and State. The leaders of the movement are themselves conscious of their power of "indoctrinating public opinion."* They believe that they are exerting it with a good measure of success; and are encouraged by the reflection, that,

Ulterior objects.

witness being asked, "When you state that you think that the Church would be stronger if Church-rates were removed, you mean that the Church would be spiritually stronger?" answers, "Certainly." And to the question, "Not stronger in its connexion with the State?" he answers "No." But this is evidently an afterthought, suggested by the obliging question, and at variance with the previous statement. For an accession of numbers, whether it makes the Church spiritually stronger or not, must tend to strengthen it as a national institution. And so one of the speakers in the debate of July 13th, 1859 (Hansard, p. 1171), is reported to have said: "The Bill was no attack on the Church; it was not a step to abolish the connexion between Church and State; they would only strengthen the Church by doing away with a grievance and an injustice." This gentleman did not know the object of the Bill; but he knew what was meant by strengthening the Church.

* Report (756), evidence of Mr. S. Morley: "In fact this question of Church-rates, as you present it, is but a small point altogether, as compared with the great question of the separation of Church and State?" "I think that the question of Church-rates is a fruitful source of irritation in many quarters, and that it would be beneficial on the highest grounds to get rid of it; but I am bound also to say, that there are views, held by not a few in connexion with that subject, with which they seek to indoctrinate public opinion so far as they have the opportunity of influencing it."

although their theory is, as they admit, "of comparatively modern origin," * it has already come into very respectable vogue.

When however I speak of the activity which they have displayed as worthy of imitation, I do not mean that I wish to see the methods which have been employed to promote the success of their cause adopted in all points by the friends of the Church. The leaders of the movement do not hold themselves responsible for the language of their agents,† and probably still less for their secret practices. The mode in which, as I have been credibly informed, signatures have been procured for petitions against Church-rates, is such as would fill me with grief and shame, if it could be proved that a like fraud upon the Legislature had been practised for the opposite end. Nor should I think it desirable that at any future election Churchmen should exact a pledge on this subject from a candidate. But I do wish that they should exercise the right of petitioning more actively than they have hitherto done. I hope that there will be fewer and fewer instances in which they remain silent because they have not experienced any difficulty in the collection of the rate. I think that they are bound carefully to observe and to bear in mind the manner in which those whom they had regarded as their friends have voted and spoken on this question, and to withdraw their confidence from every one professing to be such who has sided with their adversaries on this important point, for no better reason than that of putting an end to the dispute, and has thus shown that he will be equally ready to give up every other interest of the Church which may happen hereafter to be similarly assailed. I trust that they will learn better to appreciate the advantage, indeed the necessity, of combined action for common ends; and that they will rally round every centre where they find means of

Its mode of operation.

* Report (1683), Dr. Foster: "Can you, from your experience, trace when there arose among English Dissenters this conviction of the necessity for a separation of the Church from the State, for the good of religion?" "I think it is of comparatively modern origin."

† "There are agents who represent us in the country at times who make utterances for which I should be very sorry to be held responsible."—Mr. Morley, Report, 664.

harmonious and effective co-operation. But of this I shall have occasion to say a few words hereafter.

The subject we have been just considering is in every way closely connected with another not inferior in importance,—the attempts which have been made to alter the constitution of Endowed Schools in which religious instruction has hitherto been given according to the doctrines of the Church of England. Both movements originated in the same quarter, and are parts of one system of operations. In the case of the Endowed Schools there was indeed no profession of good will to the Church, or of any wish to "strengthen" it. In Parliament the measure which was to effect this change was represented simply as the redress of a grievance, and as a safeguard against the aggression with which the Church was threatening the rights of nonconformists. But elsewhere it was more truly described by one of its leading abvocates, as "a deadly thrust at the principle of an establishment." The alleged grievance which furnished the occasion or pretext for the attempt, was a case in which an endowed Church school had been allowed to fall under the exclusive management of dissenting trustees, who, as was ultimately decided, ought never to have had any share in it; though, on account of the peculiar nature of the trust, there was fair room to doubt whether they were not properly admissible, and perhaps a sounder discretion would have forborne to raise the useless and mischievous question. The remedy proposed was to admit Dissenters into the management of a vast number of endowed Church schools, as well as to throw them open to children of every religious persuasion. With regard to this latter object there was in the main a very general unanimity. It is to be hoped that there is no Churchman who would not wish that the children of Dissenters should partake in the benefit of the education provided by these endowments as largely as possible; that is, as far as may be without a radical change in the religious character of the schools. The only question was whether for this purpose legislative interference was needed, or likely to be useful. My own opinion is that, as no complaints have been heard on that head, and as the

Endowed Schools Bill.

Legislative interference unnecessary.

interests of a school are commonly promoted by an increased number of scholars, this matter might have been safely left to the discretion of the managers of endowed schools. My hope is that the enactment by which they are compelled to admit the children of Dissenters to the benefit of the secular instruction, and to exempt them from the necessity of attendance at the religious teaching of the school,—the provision now known under the name of a "conscience clause,"—may remain practically inoperative; as it has been found, in one very conspicuous instance where the exemption was freely granted, that no Dissenter availed himself of it.* This however was a point of secondary importance in comparison with the change which would have been effected in the character of these schools by the Endowed Schools Bill of last year. They would have been withdrawn from the religious teaching of the Church; they would not have been brought under that of any other religious body. The education so administered, with no condition but the exclusion of all definite doctrines, whatever it might have been in name, would in reality have become purely secular; and the intentions of the founders would have been frustrated, perhaps even more completely than if their endowment had been appropriated to a sect whose tenets were most widely at variance with their own. For the present, however, this "deadly thrust" aimed, not merely at "the principle of an establishment," but at Christian education, has been parried. But though in the existing constitution of the Legislature the attempt at so great an innovation proved to be premature, we have no reason to suppose that it has been abandoned, or any security that it will not be renewed in the course of a very few years under more favourable auspices. No amount of vigilance can be misemployed in guarding against this danger. And there have been some indications of its approach from a quarter in which

* In King Edward's School at Birmingham the governors were all members of the Church of England, and the doctrines of the Church were taught in the school; but parents were allowed to ask that their children might be excused attendance during those hours which were more especially devoted to religious instruction. The result was that the exemption was not asked except by a few members of the Jewish persuasion, although the school contained more than 1100 boys, of whom about one-third were the children of Dissenters.

it had been believed we might justly deem ourselves perfectly safe.

In the discussion on the mitigated, but still very mischievous form of the Endowed Schools Bill, which was brought into the House of Lords last session, it was declared by its promoters that it was never meant in any way to affect the management of National Schools, and that proper precautions should be taken to prevent the possibility of its being abused for that object. Soon after, however, some cases occurred in this diocese and in other parts of Wales, which, when they became generally known, excited great uneasiness among the friends of the National system of education, and engaged the serious attention of the committee of the National Society. One of these cases was that of a rural parish in Brecknockshire, with a small population, where there was a Church school, but attended by the children of Dissenters as well as of Churchmen, and where, though the Catechism was used, no objection had been made by any of the parents to the religious teaching. But when an effort was made to provide appropriate buildings for the school, which had been carried on in a hired room, and a grant for this purpose was sought from the Committee of Council, the promoters were informed that a grant would only be made on the twofold condition, of the insertion of a "conscience clause" in the trust deed, and the exclusion of a provision for union with the National Society. In another case, in the diocese of Llandaff, where enlarged buildings were needed, and had been recommended in the Report of Her Majesty's Inspector, for a school already united to the National Society, and likewise attended by the children of Churchmen and Dissenters, without any objection on the part of the latter to the teaching of the Catechism, a site having been procured, application was made to the Committee of Council for aid. Their Lordships in reply sent down a draft deed of conveyance, in which a "conscience clause" was inserted, and the clause of union with the National Society expunged. In a third case a similar modification of the deed of conveyance was suggested, and would apparently have been exacted as the condition of a grant, if it had not turned out

Operation of the Bill on National Schools

that the deed—the draft of which had been previously approved by their Lordships—had been executed. In a fourth case, that of the borough of Llanelly, with 10,000 inhabitants, though it appeared from the report of two of Her Majesty's Inspectors, who were sent down expressly to inquire into the circumstances, that they were such as to warrant a grant toward the establishing of a Church school, their Lordships declined to offer a grant except upon the like conditions—the "conscience clause," and the exclusion of any religious test as a qualification for admission into the committee of management. It appeared very difficult to reconcile these proceedings with the spirit, or even the letter of the engagement into which the Committee of Council had entered with the National Society, at the time when the management clauses of school deeds were the subject of a long correspondence and very earnest discussion. They seemed to justify the jealousy which was then felt by many Churchmen, of the Committee's interference with the management of Church schools. They were the more startling on account of their manifest affinity with the principle and objects of the Endowed Schools Bill, and because they looked like a covert attempt to extend even that part of the measure which had not passed into a law, to a class of cases which had been expressly exempted from the operation of the Act. And there was yet another coincidence which suggested still stronger ground for alarm.

School Inspector's Report.

In my last Charge I alluded very briefly to a Report of one of Her Majesty's Inspectors of Schools, in which he had "thought proper to advise the Committee of Council to modify its system, for the express purpose of favouring the schools of the British and Foreign School Society in the Principality, at the expense of the Church schools." Startling as this recommendation was, I touched upon it but slightly, because I was then able to express a hope "that the time was yet distant when the efforts of the Church to promote the religious education of her children, would be directly and avowedly discouraged by any government in this country." I could not now speak with the same degree of hopefulness on this point; for it is impossible not

to see that, if the recent proceedings which I have just stated,—and which do not include all the cases that have come to my knowledge,—are to be taken as samples of a policy which has been deliberately adopted, that is the very policy which was recommended in Mr. Bowstead's Report. And it may now be useful to quote his language in the passage to which I alluded. He observes: "There is a rare opportunity for action on the part of the Government at the present moment, and I am sanguine enough to believe that it might be so used as to give a decided and lasting impulse to the march of education in the district. But, for this purpose, some modification of the present official system is absolutely indispensable. South Wales must be recognized as a land of Dissenters, and the schools intended for its benefit must be such as to command the confidence of men who hold nothing so precious as perfect religious freedom. The right of the parent to be the sole director of his child's religious training must be held sacred: and the idea that men zealously attached to one denomination can be content to leave the education of their offspring at the mercy of the ministers of another, must be altogether abandoned. The Nonconformists of South Wales are firmly resolved to submit to no domination on the part of the Establishment; but they have no desire to exercise dominion themselves. They are for the most part ready to act with the Church on terms of perfect equality, and to support combined schools, basing their highest teaching upon the Bible, but rejecting all Catechisms and denominational peculiarities. The schools best suited for such a population are those based upon the unsectarian principles of the British and Foreign School Society. This at least should be the general type; but denominational schools might still be sanctioned in special cases; where it could be shown that they were necessary, or even that there was a fair prospect of their permanent success."

But for the fuller understanding of Mr. Bowstead's views, and of the grounds of his recommendation, it will be necessary to extract a few more sentences, in which the efforts of Churchmen in the work of education are compared with those of Dissenters. "The people (in the South Wales district) are anxious for instruc-

tion, especially in the English language; but it is most commonly offered to them under circumstances which are distasteful. The schools established by the wealthy for their poorer neighbours are naturally enough connected, as a general rule, with the Established Church, to which the wealthy belong; and the children educated in them run the risk of being imbued with catechisms and formularies which their parents not seldom hold in a sort of abhorrence. Many stand aloof altogether from such institutions, and either leave their children entirely untaught, except in the Sunday schools, or obtain for them elsewhere an education which is at once more costly, and, in a secular point of view, less effective. Others risk the evil for the sake of some accompanying good, and carefully counteract at home the bias which the school has a tendency to give; so that children of tender years, instead of being trained up by the united efforts of parents and teachers in the way they should go, are played like a ball between two contending parties, and must often lose all stable conviction in the struggle."

Report continued.

Further remarks.

After this, having given the statistics of the schools not exclusively connected with the Church, of which he states that, with the exception of three, they "are not denominational at all, but intended to combine Protestants of all sects," he proceeds to say, "It must be admitted that this is a very poor display when the position of Dissent in the district is considered; but it will seem poorer still when I add that the largest and most important of these schools have not been established by Dissenters at all, but by enlightened employers of labour, themselves generally attached to the Established Church, but convinced by experience and knowledge of the people that Church schools cannot succeed among them. (This remark is made as if it applied to all parts of South Wales, but the schools enumerated are all in the Mining District of Glamorganshire.) The Nonconformists themselves have done little."

Inactivity of Nonconformists.

The cause to which this inactivity is attributed is very remarkable. It is that the majority, adopting the principles of the Church Liberation Society, had refused to

accept aid from the State. "Upon this the minority retired from the field, and quietly awaited those results which their friends had promised to bring about without any contamination from the co-operation of the State. They have waited some seven years, and the expected results are nowhere to be seen." But at length, in the year 1854, Mr. Bowstead thought he saw signs of a change passing upon the nonconformist mind as to this question. The "conviction that the necessary work of education cannot be done by voluntary effort alone, had brought over many to the view of the minority." And thus had arisen that rare and golden opportunity which Mr. Bowstead urges the Government to improve by a modification of the official system; and this modification, so far as regards the point we are now considering, he afterwards defines more precisely, as to be accomplished by a "simple resolution," that "the exceptional condition of the district, especially with regard to religious persuasion, should be recognized, and the establishment in every locality of schools suited to that condition should receive the most liberal encouragement." It must be remembered that such schools had previously received as liberal a measure of encouragement as had been extended to those of the Church. The object therefore of the proposed resolution was not simply to encourage the one class of schools, but to favour them at the expense of the other.

Reaction.

No such resolution has ever been announced by the Committee of Council. But its recent proceedings certainly suggest a suspicion that it has begun to act upon Mr. Bowstead's recommendation, and in a sense which he himself did not venture distinctly to express, and possibly had not clearly in his view. For he seems to have contemplated rather an augmentation in the scale of grants to Dissenting schools, than the withholding of aid from Church schools, or the imposing of conditions which would render the offer of a grant nugatory. When the attention of the Committee of the National Society was drawn to the subject, they deemed it of sufficient importance to call for a memorial, in which they deprecated the adoption of the policy

Proceedings of Committee of Council.

recommended by Mr. Bowstead, and a deputation waited on the Lord President for the purpose of receiving his answer. But the only fruit of the interview was a promise that the case which afforded the most prominent ground of complaint should be reconsidered. Nothing was said which could be construed as a disavowal of the policy which it had been thought to indicate. It may be, however, that the inadequacy of the parliamentary grant, and the necessity of husbanding it with the most rigid economy, have had no slight influence on this part of the proceedings of the Committee of Council, as the same cause appears to have prevented them from complying with the applications which they have received, in accordance with the recommendation of several of Her Majesty's Inspectors, to relax their regulations for the purpose of smoothing the difficulties which beset the work of education in the poorer and more backward districts of the Principality. We must all deplore the existence of such a necessity; above all, if, as is understood to be the case, it is connected with a disposition in any of our leading statesmen to view with jealousy the growth of this branch of public expenditure, and a wish to see it curtailed. It seems clear that the tendency of that disposition must be to issue in the abandonment of the present system, and the substitution of some entirely different mode of providing for the educational wants of the people. For as long as that system is maintained, and the public money destined to this purpose is wisely, carefully, and impartially administered, every friend of education must desire that a fund which has yielded such incalculable benefit to the highest interests of the community should be increased rather than diminished. How, if it should be withdrawn, its place would be supplied, and what kind of system would be substituted for that which has hitherto worked so successfully, it is not difficult to conjecture. But it would be premature now to enter into that question, one of the gravest that can ever come under the consideration of the Legislature. The country is anxiously looking forward to the time when the Education Commission shall have brought its long-protracted labours to a close, and shall report the conclusions to

Inadequacy of Parliamentary grant.

which it has been led, and the measures which it is prepared to recommend. In the meanwhile we can only hope that whatever change may be deemed expedient, may be as much in harmony with the interests of religion, as the system which it supersedes.

Inferences from the foregoing Report.

But before I quit this topic, I must revert to the extracts which I read from Mr. Bowstead's Report, for the sake of two remarks. You will have observed, not I think without a feeling of just satisfaction, how large a part of the work of education throughout this division of the Principality, is admitted, by one whose official sympathy at least is entirely on the side of Dissent, to have been done by Churchmen. That is certainly, at first sight, a reason why their exertions should not be either positively or relatively discouraged. That they have in fact suffered positive discouragement, appears from the cases to which I have referred, however we may trust that these are not to be regarded as samples of a settled policy. But they would also be relatively discouraged, if, while *they* continued to receive the same measure of aid as before, a larger amount was given to those of another party. They would be so discouraged, if, while regulations which tend to impede *them*, were rigorously construed and inflexibly enforced, the same regulations were, in the case of that other party, interpreted and applied with the greatest possible indulgence. How far in this sense a preference has been shown to Dissenting schools, must of course be very difficult to ascertain. But I observe that Mr. Bowstead, in his Report for the year following that of the one from which I have quoted (1855), speaks of "the increased liberality of their Lordships' building grants," as having promoted the establishment of Dissenting schools in Wales. So far at least his recommendation of the year before had been adopted. But of any such increase in the case of Church Schools, I have never yet heard; and the Report of the Rev. H. Longueville Jones, the Inspector of Church of England schools, for the same year, is entirely silent on that head. He only complains, that the conditions attached to the grants of the Committee of Council are such, as to exclude the greater portion of Wales from all participation in the benefit.

It is due however to Mr. Bowstead to observe, that in the latter Report he speaks of "strict impartiality between different classes," as a "cardinal requisite." But how such impartiality is consistent with that special encouragement which he had recommended to be given to the establishment of Dissenting schools, he did not think it necessary to explain. Perhaps the "classes" to which he here refers, are the "denominational schools" (including those of the Church), which he saw it might be for some time longer necessary still to sanction: as the strictest impartiality towards such schools would of course be quite consistent with that exclusive favour which he recommends to be shown to those of the British and Foreign system.

Education received by children of Dissenters in Church schools.

The other point to which I wish to draw your attention, is the account given by the same gentleman of the feelings with which the education offered in Church schools is commonly accepted by Dissenting parents. It is, as he states, with the painful belief, that their children "run the risk of being imbued with catechisms and formularies which they themselves not seldom hold in a sort of abhorrence." There can be no doubt that this statement was made with a full conviction of its truth. But I believe that Mr. Bowstead had no means of ascertaining whether it was correct or not, as a representation of the ordinary state of things—and it is only as such that it can be of the slightest importance—and further that, so considered, it conveys a most erroneous impression. I am persuaded that it would be doing great injustice to Nonconformists to impute such a sentiment, either to the more intelligent and better educated among them, or to the great mass of their people. Wherever it does exist, I believe it to be the result of fanatical or dishonest teaching, working upon ignorance and credulity. In justification of this belief, I might appeal to some patent and notorious facts, well known, I believe, to most of you. At a period within living memory, one of the most numerous of the Welsh dissenting bodies, the Calvinistic Methodists, retaining the remembrance of their origin, still resorted to their parish churches for Holy Communion: nor was the discontinuance of

that practice, as I have been credibly informed, the result of any wider alienation on points of doctrine, or any dislike of our formularies, but simply of a growing laxity of opinion with regard to the unity of the Church, and the origin and conditions of ministerial authority. Nor, with the exception of the Unitarians, is there any other body of Protestant Dissenters whose members do not occasionally, and, which is more important, may not, as often as they are so inclined, in perfect consistency with their peculiar tenets, take part in our public worship. Many of you must know, from your own experience, as I do, how little Dissenting parents are actually deterred from sending their children to our National Schools, by that bugbear of the Catechism, which assumes such formidable dimensions in Mr. Bowstead's Report. I rather wish that his statement on that head had been better grounded in fact, and that, where the Catechism is taught to such children, it was less uncommon than I fear it is, for their parents to inquire of them as to the religious instruction which they receive in the school. I am quite sure that wherever a proper use is made of the Catechism, the result of such an inquiry would not be to create or to foster any "sort of abhorrence," or to impose upon the parent the duty of counteracting the teaching of the school by his private instruction, at the risk of breaking up the foundation of religious belief in the mind of the child; but, on the contrary, that it would be highly beneficial both to the child and to the parent, and would directly tend to disabuse the inquirer of any prejudices he might have conceived against the Church and her doctrine.

Dissenters and the Catechism.

These statements would hardly have deserved any serious attention, and might have been passed over in silence as absurd exaggerations, if unhappily there was not reason to fear that they have received implicit credit in the quarter to which they were addressed, and have been mainly instrumental in bringing about a change of system, which, if persevered in, will I believe strike a heavy blow at the cause of religious education throughout the country.

When I spoke just now of the proper use of the Catechism,

it was with a definite meaning, which I wish to explain. Some years ago I was led to recommend a more general and systematic observance of the special purpose of the Catechism, indicated by the place it occupies in the Prayer Books of Edward the Sixth, as a preparation for Confirmation. I must now add, that, although every part of it is subordinate to this end, yet the great bulk of its contents—the explanation of the Creed, the Ten Commandments, and the Lord's Prayer—is independent of this object, while it affords an ample groundwork for instruction in the principles of Christian faith and practice, which, with the exception of the Unitarians, is recognised by all who bear the name of Christ, and therefore almost every where suited to all the children who attend our schools. To build on this foundation, is a task, sufficient indeed to exercise the highest faculties of any teacher, but yet not exceeding the capacity of one who has been duly trained. On the other hand, those parts of the Catechism which are specially adapted to learners who are, before long, to become candidates for Confirmation, contain points of theology which would be more properly reserved for the teaching of the clergyman. The distinction is one which it may be generally useful to bear in mind, and particularly with reference to the question we have been just considering.

Proper use of the Catechism.

I now pass to a subject, of at least not inferior importance to the well-being of the Church: the Revision of the Liturgy.

Revision of the Liturgy.

The motion which was made on this subject in the House of Lords in the year 1858, and then withdrawn in compliance with the universal feeling of the House, was renewed last Session, in a slightly different form, with a like result. The immediate object of each motion was to obtain the appointment of a Royal Commission. In the terms of the first motion, the business of the Commission was, "to consider whether the Liturgy of the Church of England be not capable of such alterations as may render it more profitable than it now is for the religious instruction and edification of the people." The second motion was worded at much greater length, and so as to be at once more

specific and more comprehensive. It set forth some of the grounds on which it was proposed: an extract from the Preface to the Book of Common Prayer, on the reasonableness of occasional alterations in the particular forms of Divine worship, and the rites and ceremonies appointed to be used therein; a statement, that "the Book of Canons is fit to be reviewed and made more suitable to the state of the Church;" and, that "it is desirable, as far as may be, to remove all unnecessary barriers to a union of the people in the matter of public worship;" and the work assigned to the Royal Commission, was "to prepare such alterations and amendments in the Canons and Book of Common Prayer, as to them may appear desirable, and to consider of such other matters as in their judgment may most conduce to the ends above mentioned." This change of form is not an unimportant feature in the history of the movement.

Rejection of the motion for a Royal Commission.

On neither occasion was a single voice raised in support of the motion; but on the second it was met by a more decided and powerful opposition than on the first. The annals of Parliament can afford no example of more complete failure. The fact, however, may easily be misinterpreted, and it is highly desirable that it should be correctly understood, and referred to its true cause. Without this, we could not rightly apprehend the actual state of the question. It would be a great mistake to attribute the result to indifference, or a slackening of interest, with regard to it; or to a general prejudice against any kind of alteration in the particular forms of Divine worship, and the rites and ceremonies appointed to be used therein; or to a vague apprehension that the Liturgy could not be touched without ruinous consequences.* On the contrary, the subject has excited a lively interest among Churchmen of all parties, which has been continually growing, rather than at all abated, having been nourished by a very abundant issue of controversial writings. It

* That such a writer as the organ of the extreme Ultramontane party in France should have affected to view it in this light, was quite to be expected; but not so that this sample of his spirit should have been thought worthy of publication (Appendix to Lord Ebury's Speech, May 6th, 1858) as strengthening the argument in favour of Revision.

has never ceased to occupy a considerable share of the attention of both Houses of Convocation; and the Noble Mover was able to cite many passages from the speeches and writings of several among those who were adverse to his motion, in which they had recorded their deliberate opinion, that some alterations in the particular forms of Divine worship prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer were highly desirable. It seems that he thought this sufficient to warrant an expectation, that those who so far concurred with him, would go along with him to his practical conclusion; and that, when they declined to do so, he was not only disappointed, but really surprised, by what he regarded as their almost inexplicable inconsistency. No wonder therefore that their line of proceeding should have furnished an occasion to less candid and temperate advocates of his cause for coarse insinuations and misplaced ridicule.*

Causes of the rejection.

Yet the true cause of the final result appears so manifest, that it is difficult to conceive how it can have escaped the observation of any one who has followed with due attention the course of the discussions which have taken place on the question. That which determined the fate of the motion, was, in one word, the unlimited, and therefore unpractical character of the proposal. Its author thought it expedient to frame it so as to meet the views of all who, on any ground, were favourable to a revision of the Liturgy; and the consequence was, that he united, in opposition to it, all who were not prepared to adopt it on every ground, and for every object which others had in view. The terms of the first motion were, as we have seen, large enough to embrace every kind of change which it was possible to suggest, but did not indicate any in particular. It was only from the speech with which it was prefaced, that it was possible to gather the intentions of the mover; and the only ground on which he expressly rested it, was the need of abridgment in the stated Services of the Church. As to any other kind of alteration that he thought desirable, he confined himself to a brief and general allusion in a single sentence,

* I am not, however, sure that there has been more than one example of this mode of conducting the controversy.

in which he spoke of some "changes which had been asked for" in some of the Occasional Services, which, "though small, were of great importance, as many of the Clergy feel their consciences burdened by expressions which are used; and though a latitude of interpretation is permitted, they are considered too dogmatic, and, to some minds, not susceptible of such expanded meaning." Any one who compared the extreme slightness and vagueness of this allusion to differences of opinion among the clergy, as to the precise meaning of some expressions which occur in the formularies which they all habitually use, with the prominence which had been given to the complaint about the alleged wearisome length and repetitions of the Liturgy, would naturally conclude that, in the speaker's own view, the changes to which he so briefly and incidentally referred, were of secondary importance, and that those on which he dwelt at great length, and with abundance of details, might be properly considered as his main object, and that which he wished to present as the most solid groundwork of his proposal. If afterwards, as he drew near to the close of his address, when it is usual for an orator to become a little warmed by his theme, he for a few moments took a far wider range, and glanced at differences between Churchmen and Nonconformists, which, as was expected by "many whose opinions are well worthy of attention," would be reconciled by alterations in our Liturgy—though he was not himself prepared to assert that such would be the effect—it would have been hard to construe such language as evidence of any deliberate design. And the severity with which, in the previous part of his speech, he had abstained from any attempt to influence the judgment of his hearers by the arts of rhetoric, might seem to have fairly earned him a right to the little flourish in which he indulged, when he pointed a period with the illustrious names of "a Livingstone and a Havelock," without any inquiry as to the exact amount of change which would be required in order "to include" those excellent persons "in our communion."

Thus, on the whole, the question raised was, not whether a Revision of the Liturgy was desirable or not, but it was first, whether the kind of change which had been

The question at issue.

represented as the main object of the Revision would be a gain; and, if so, then the far graver question, whether the gain was of such importance as to render it expedient to set in motion the machinery of a Royal Commission? On the first question there may have been a variety of opinions. It was one which did not admit of a full discussion in Parliament. But on the second, which was the only practical question, there appears to have been entire unanimity, with the single exception of the mover himself.

Altered on the second motion.

But on the second occasion the state of the case was materially altered, both as to the terms of the motion, and the language by which it was prefaced and expounded. In the course of the two years which intervened between the first and the second attempt, the views of the parliamentary leader of the movement had been, not perhaps changed, but at least more fully developed. That which on the first occasion had been the almost exclusive topic of his speech, was now barely noticed in the fewest possible words. That which he had then touched upon most briefly and lightly, he now dwelt upon almost exclusively. He was indeed very far from abandoning the ground which he took at the first. On the contrary, his personal feelings on the complaints which he had urged against the structure of the Liturgy, on the score of excessive length and wearisome repetition, had been so much strengthened, that he could not refrain from appealing to public sympathy through the medium of a newspaper. But, notwithstanding his heightened sense of this grievance, he had learnt to consider it as a matter of trifling importance in comparison with the subject which now engaged his chief attention,—the differences of opinion which prevail among Churchmen, and those which separate Dissenters from the Church. The evils of this disunion were exhibited as arising from the Act of Uniformity, and the remedy as to be sought in the proposed Revision of the Prayer Book. And, in accordance with this view, one of the ends to which the labours of the Commission were to be directed was, "to remove all unnecessary barriers to a union of the people in the matter of public worship." The question was thus made to turn upon the expediency

Differences among Churchmen, and between them and Dissenters.

of undertaking to reconcile contending parties within the Church, and to bring Dissenters into her communion, by means of certain operations to be performed upon the Prayer Book. The common and (with the single inevitable exception) unanimous sense of the House decided in the negative.

There are yet two or three points in the history of this matter which are worthy of notice. In the speech with which the noble lord introduced his motion, and which he has since published, he expressed himself as follows: "I am sure your lordships will agree with me in thinking that any attempt to force alterations upon the Clergy of the Established Church, which are distasteful I will not say to the majority, but even to any considerable minority of them, would be as foolish as it would be fruitless. Rightly or wrongly, the bulk of the Clergy look to Convocation as their representative and guide, and will never willingly consent to any thing which has not its previous sanction." Probably no sentiment in the speech was received with more general approbation than this. And it was not unnatural that, when such deference had been expressed, not merely for the judgment, but even for the taste of the Clergy, some attempt should be made to ascertain what were their opinions and feelings on a subject which so deeply concerned them. They were consequently invited to sign a Declaration, "expressing their conviction that any attempt at the present time to alter the Book of Common Prayer would be attended with great danger to the peace and unity of the Church." The invitation expressly referred to the passage which I have cited from the speech on the first motion, and therefore must have been generally understood as intended simply to raise the question, whether the Clergy desired that the motion should be renewed. But yet I think it probable that many may have been deterred from subscribing, by the apprehension that they might be considered as pledging themselves to oppose every kind of alteration, by whatever means it might be effected. The Declaration, however, was signed by about 10,000 of the Clergy, including many who belong to very different theological schools, and was conveyed to the noble person whom it

Attempt to ascertain the opinions of the clergy.

was intended to satisfy, before he renewed the motion which it deprecated.

The result showed how utterly they had mistaken his meaning, when they fancied that he was disposed to pay respect to the wishes and feelings of any number of the Clergy. It turned out that all he meant was, that those who could convince him by their arguments were at liberty to do so. But the subscribers of the Declaration had not even entered into any discussion of the subject. It could, therefore, hardly be treated with too much contempt, especially as the signatures only amounted to about Ten Thousand; a number sufficient to furnish occasion for pleasantry, but which could have no more weight when it represented those who disapproved of his proposal, than the dulness of the House of Lords when it showed itself equally insensible to the force of his reasoning. On the other hand, he conceived that he was entitled to claim all who had not signed it as well-wishers to his attempt. He omitted to notice that all of these had not been silent; but that some months before the Declaration, a Petition to Her Majesty, in which his views were embodied, had been circulated among the Clergy, but had only received 460 signatures. Yet this is a fact which seems materially to affect the state of the case. If the number of signatures to the Declaration was not large enough of itself to be entitled to respect, because it might not represent a majority of the Clergy, it must at least be allowed to be very considerable when compared with that of the subscribers to the Petition. And if the silence of those who withheld their signatures from the Declaration was to be taken, as it fairly might, as a proof that they were not adverse to every kind of alteration, the silence of those who refused to sign the Petition was far more emphatic, and made it clear that the immense majority of the Clergy did not approve of the proposal which was afterwards unanimously rejected in the House of Lords.

Object of the Declaration.

Result of a previous petition.

When we are considering the means of collecting the opinions of the Clergy on this subject, it would not be right to pass over that which has been expressed by the Convocation of the Province of

Canterbury. And it is the more important to advert to it, because the proceedings of that Convocation on this head were referred to by the noble leader of the revision movement in his speech on the second occasion, in a way which showed that he had been totally misinformed as to their real nature: and though the mistake into which he had fallen was slightly noticed in the course of the debate, as it has not been corrected or acknowledged in the publication of the speech, it is likely to lead many into the like error. It is there represented that there was a division between the Upper and the Lower House of Convocation on the subject; that the Upper House, in contradiction to its own previously expressed sentiments, had "come to a determination that they would not countenance any alteration whatever in the Liturgy:" but that the Lower House was so far from concurring in this resolution, that "when they were invited by one of their own members to express their approval of it, so unequivocally was the feeling expressed against it, that the proposer did not venture to divide."

Opinion of the two Houses of Convocation.

That this statement was grounded on some information which the noble speaker believed to be authentic, there can be no doubt; though I cannot even imagine from what source it can have been derived: but an account more nearly the exact reverse of that which actually took place, it would be difficult to conceive. It appears from the "Chronicle of Convocation," a work which, I believe, contains both a complete and accurate record of its proceedings, that, in the session of June, 1859, the Upper House agreed to an address to Her Majesty containing the following paragraph: "We cannot refrain from taking this occasion of expressing to your Majesty an opinion concerning certain attempts which have been recently made to bring about a change in the Prayer Book. We believe that the force of one argument for such a change, depending upon the alleged undue length of some of the services, has, to a certain extent, been removed by the recently authorised use of the Litany as a separate service." When the draft of the address was sent down to the Lower House, a debate arose upon this

Statements respecting it erroneous.

paragraph; but it turned entirely on the clause relating to the use of the Litany as a separate service. Some speakers objected to such a use of the Litany. Others thought that so slight an allusion to the attempts which had been made to bring about a change in the Prayer Book, would tend rather to encourage than to check them. Others wished to strike out the paragraph, lest it should be construed as an admission that there was some weight in the objections to the length of the service. But it was generally felt that it ought to include a clause distinctly expressing the mind of Convocation as to the proposed Revision. And accordingly it went back to the Upper House with an addition to that effect, which was carried with scarcely a dissentient voice: "Looking to the general question, we declare our decided conviction that the supposed advantages of a Revision of the Book of Common Prayer are far outweighed by the manifest disadvantages of such a course, especially at the present time." There was therefore entire harmony between the two Houses on this point.

Convocation free from inconsistency.

Nor have they, or either of them, laid themselves open to the charge of inconsistency or vacillation which has been brought against them. From the language in which that complaint was made, any one would be led to suppose that Convocation had first encouraged the attempts which have been made for a Revision of the Liturgy, and had afterwards declared itself against that which had been done in compliance with its own suggestions. But this is a supposition which could only arise from the want of correct information as to the proceedings of Convocation on this subject. Every one who is acquainted with their real history knows that the object which Convocation had in view when it first addressed itself to the consideration of the Services of the Church, was simply "to make a better provision for the spiritual wants of great masses of our people who are at present beyond the reach of our ordinary ministrations." And in 1854 a committee was appointed to inquire into the means by which she might be enabled to accomplish this object. It was, in fact, an effort for the more efficient prosecu-

tion of her home missionary work. All the recommendations of the committee relating to the use of the Prayer Book were adapted to this end. No one contemplated the slightest alteration in the services used on ordinary occasions; least of all any change of language bearing on questions of doctrine.

But it was also felt, that there was a want which it was desirable to supply, of Special Services to be framed for certain incidental occasions of more or less frequent occurrence. This last object has never ceased to occupy the attention of Convocation, and some not unimportant steps have been taken toward the better provision for spiritual destitution, so far as regards the use of the Prayer Book. It was found that larger powers had been left by the Act of Uniformity in the hands of the Bishops for this purpose, than had been commonly supposed: that, with the sanction of the Diocesan, the Litany may be used by itself: and that it is not invariably necessary that the sermon should be preceded by the Office of Morning and Evening Prayer. The facilities thus given for carrying the ministrations of the Church among masses which they could hardly otherwise reach, have been found so useful, as in this respect to leave little to desire. But there has been no action of Convocation to lend the slightest countenance to either of the two most prominent and characteristic features of the proposal made in the House of Lords for the Revision of the Prayer Book: the abbreviation of the ordinary services, and the alteration of its language for the twofold purpose of adapting it to the views of any party in the Church, and the comprehension of Dissenters. And among the speakers in either House, who delivered their opinions on this subject, there was hardly one who did not strongly protest against such an attempt. Whether it be wise or not, it can plead no authority of Convocation in its favour. Special Services.

It is important that the proceedings of Convocation should be rightly understood, and that it should not be suffered to remain under a groundless imputation of inconsistency. Whether the conduct of one of its members can be vindicated from the same charge, is comparatively immaterial. And I should not on my

own account have thought it worth while to notice the share of it which has been laid upon myself, though I believe it is rather heavier than that which has fallen upon any other individual. But, as it has been supposed that the opinions which I delivered on this subject in previous Charges, are at variance with those which I have since expressed in Convocation and in Parliament, I am bound either to admit or deny the fact; because, if my views on this head had undergone any change, those whom I address from this chair would have a right to be informed of it. But on looking back at the language which I used on former occasions, I find that it was so far from being such as to warrant an expectation, that I should give my support to the recent attempts for the Revision of the Liturgy, that, if it was to determine my subsequent line of action, it pledged me to resist those attempts. In 1845 I had occasion to advert to the question which was then warmly discussed, as to the observance of the Rubrics. I observed that, if the Church had enjoyed greater freedom of deliberation on matters affecting her spiritual interests, that controversy would (as I then thought "undoubtedly") "have given occasion for a comprehensive and exact review of our ritual, for the purpose, not merely of terminating disputes on ambiguous points by an authoritative declaration, but likewise of correcting anomalies, retrenching superfluities, supplying defects, and, in a word, of applying the results of her gathered experience and her collective wisdom, to remove every blemish, and to adapt the whole as much as possible to her present condition, and the actual wants of her children." I referred to a document which had been signed eleven years before by a great majority of the whole body of the clergy, as proving that they at least did not hold that our Liturgy is "absolutely perfect." And I concluded with the words which have been cited by several persons to show that I was then in favour of such a kind of alteration as has been since proposed. "We may very well maintain that our Liturgy is excellent in its parts, and good even as a whole, that is, better suited than any other we know of to the purpose of public devotion, and affording no

Author's share in the proceedings of Convocation.

ground or fair excuse for separation; and yet believe it capable of some important improvements, and earnestly desire that it should receive them." From this language it might certainly be inferred that I thought a Revision of the Rubrics highly desirable. But I made no allusion—the occasion suggested none—to changes of any other kind. And even as to this I expressed my belief, "that those who are most anxious for a Revision of the Liturgy, would perhaps most earnestly deprecate the attempting such a work at a time, when the events which seem most clearly to show the need of it, have called up a spirit of party, which would almost inevitably take possession of it, and strive to mould it to its own ends."

Remarks on Revision in the previous Charge.

In my last Charge I was led to the same subject by a very different occasion. It was with reference to a work then recently published, in which the author called for a Revision of the Liturgy, for the purpose of restoring, what he termed, "Liturgical purity," or as I stated it, that "of adapting it to a peculiar system of doctrine, for which its partizans had hitherto been satisfied with the shelter which it found in the language of our present formularies." I protested strongly against such an attempt, but at the same time expressed a not less decided opinion in favour of Liturgical changes of a different kind, "the most important" of which I described as consisting in "enlarged facilities for a freer use of the contents of the Prayer Book and the Bible," "improvements," which "would be effected mainly by some slight alterations in the Rubric and the Calendar." I also recognized the want of a greater number of Special Services, as well as of a greater variety of Prayers and Thanksgivings for extraordinary occasions; and I suggested, as a question worthy of consideration, whether the language of the Prayer Book required or admitted of improvement; but with the restriction, "for purposes as to which, in principle, all would agree," farther explained as the "removing of all needless occasions of offence or mistake arising from an obsolete or ambiguous phraseology."

Views then expressed unchanged.

As to these points therefore I need only say now, that my views remain unchanged, both as to that which I

desired, and that which I deprecated. But there are some others, which I did not then touch, but which seem now to call for a few remarks.

Shortening of the Morning Service.

With some persons one of the main objects for the sake of which they ask for a Revision of the Liturgy, is the shortening of the ordinary Sunday Morning Service; and this, as we have seen, was put forward in the first discussion of the subject in Parliament, with a prominence which threw every other into the shade. It has often been urged on the ground of casual and exceptional circumstances, which, as I think, ought not to be allowed to affect our view of the question. Thus, the Service is said to be too long for children, and for very aged and weakly persons, and, when protracted by an extraordinary number of communicants, for the whole of that part of the congregation. But the very enumeration of these cases shows that they are quite foreign to the purpose, unless it was proposed to reduce the usual length of the office to that which would suit tender or decrepit age, and extreme debility. The proper remedy for the inconvenience in the case of children, should evidently be sought under the head of Special Services. And so it may be desirable that there should be some special provision for that which arises from an extraordinary prolongation of the Communion Service. But whether this would be practicable or not, it seems clear that no abbreviation which any one would think of proposing for the ordinary Service, would answer that purpose.

Circumstances to be taken into account.

Then again, if the question is to be fairly raised, we must not only confine it to the average duration of the ordinary Service, but must keep it clear of assumptions which either do not, or need not apply to the ordinary state of things. We must suppose that the Service is conducted according to the intention of the Church, with the simple appliances which are within the reach of every congregation which chooses to use them; that the minister is not obliged to read it right through, without any intervals for congregational psalmody; and that it is read in such a manner as to give to every part its proper and natural effect, and to promote and not impede devotion. We must also

suppose the fulfilment of certain conditions on the part of the congregation, which are commonly implied in the very act of attendance on public worship: such as a moderate degree of intelligence, and attentiveness, and a frame of mind, at least not altogether alien from the professed object of their coming together. To attempt to supply the place of these requisites by any process, either of abridgment or alteration, would evidently be the vainest of all lost labours. Our Services were not, and cannot be adapted for the use of persons who come not for the sake of worship at all; or who come with a strong prejudice against Liturgical forms, and only consent to sit through the prayers for the sake of the sermon; or who listen to them, rather to find materials for criticism, than a help to devotion. But when the question is disengaged from all irrelevant circumstances, the objection which has been raised against the ordinary Service, on the score of excessive length, seems to me so untenable, that I cannot believe it expresses a feeling which is shared by many, either of the clergy or the laity. I am at a loss to understand how a Service, which, including the sermon, with both chanting and singing, does not occupy more than an hour and three quarters, can be considered as too severe a strain on the physical, mental, or spiritual energies of any ordinary person. But if there was good ground for this complaint, the amount of relief which would be afforded by any curtailment that has been hitherto proposed is so trifling, that it would be hardly worth discussing, even if it did not involve changes of structure, which, in the opinion of some of the most competent judges, would damage the character of the Office.

Retrenchment of repetitions.

The demand for the retrenchment of repetitions, arising out of the continuous recitation of three distinct Offices, rests upon an entirely different ground, and is more serious, as well as more specious; but I doubt whether it is really better warranted. I think it is based on questionable principles, as well as on a great exaggeration of the alleged evil. It is contended that the recurrence of the same petition in the course of the same Service, though each time in a totally different connexion, as the Lord's Prayer and the Collect for the Day, and the use

of more than one petition relating to the same object, though not only framed in different language, but suggesting a totally different point of view, as those for the Queen in the Litany and the Communion Office; and also the repeated exhibition of summaries of faith, though in various degrees of development, as the Creeds: that these things tend to quench the spirit of devotion, and to convert its exercise into a mechanical routine. That a recurring prayer is often passively heard, or mechanically repeated, is too probable; but whether oftener than on its first occurrence, seems very much to depend on the farther question, whether it calls up the same train of ideas each time. And it is not clear that this must be the case even with the Collects, which are eminently pregnant and suggestive; least of all with the Lord's Prayer, which has yielded matter for so many volumes of exposition. Still less can I feel the weight of an objection which has been urged against the present combination of the three Offices in one Service, on the ground that each contains utterances of penitential feeling, which cannot follow so close on one another without a great diminution of fervour and earnestness at each successive recurrence. It has been thought unreasonable to expect that the worshipper, having once been led to express that feeling, should return again and again to the same state of mind without a violent and painful effort, which ought not to be required of him. I very much doubt the correctness of this view, which seems to imply that a religious feeling, such as the consciousness of sin, is to be considered as spent when it has once been suitably expressed, and not as something continually subsisting, and always ready to be called into exercise. But if the objection was well founded, it would require, not only the excision of the introductory portion of the Morning Service, and the omission of the Litany whenever it would be followed by the entire Communion Office, but a great change in the structure of that Office itself, in which, even after the explicit Confession and Absolution, the remembrance of sin is presumed to be as lively as before, and to be inextricably blended with the highest acts of praise and thanksgiving. And as this is clearly not a fault which it would be desirable or possible to correct,

but a necessity inherent in the very nature of the Office, it seems to take away the edge of the objection when applied to those which precede it.

But while, for these reasons, I can feel little sympathy with the complaints which have been made against the ordinary Sunday Morning Service, I cannot say that I am equally satisfied with our existing arrangements for the occasions on which the Holy Communion is administered. I do believe that they stand in the way of a return, or a nearer approximation, to the primitive practice of a weekly celebration, once regarded as the main and most indispensable business of the Lord's Day; and that, where they do not prevent it, they more or less interfere with its proper effect. The Service which ends with the sermon, even when that is of moderate length, is thought by some to be too long, by most to be long enough. If so, there must be an excess in the addition of another part which sometimes lasts as long as that which precedes it. And it is attended with this peculiar disadvantage, that whenever—as can hardly fail to be more or less frequently the case—it produces a sense of weariness and languor, this feeling must weigh just on the highest act of worship, for which it is so very desirable that the mind and spirit should retain all their freshness and vigour unimpaired. I must therefore own that, so far as regards the communicants, I think it would be an advantage if both the Office of Morning Prayer and the Litany were separated on such occasions from the Communion Service. But it must be remembered that for the non-communicants this would practically involve the entire loss of that which to them is the most important part of their devotions. For even in the very few cases where it would be practicable to afford them the opportunity of attending two Morning Services, the habits of modern Society would prevent them, with rare exceptions, from availing themselves of it. To reconcile the spiritual interests of the two classes by any Liturgical arrangements would, I think, be found an extremely difficult, not to say insoluble, problem. But the end might be attained in a different way. There is now nothing, but the dread either of singularity or of disturbing

Administration of Holy Communion.

the rest of the congregation, to prevent those who intend to communicate from entering in the interval between the end of the Litany and the beginning of the Communion Service. And if it was once generally understood that this was a perfectly allowable practice, and every requisite precaution was taken to prevent it from occasioning disorder, no one would be deterred from it on either of those grounds. I do not say that it is absolutely desirable that such a usage should become prevalent, but only that, where the inconvenience is felt, it would provide an effectual and simple mode of relief.

Abridgment of Morning Service for week-days.

Whether an abridgment of the Morning Service on week-days is desired by those who are now in the habit of attending it, or would be likely to attract others, is a question on which I shall not undertake to pronounce an opinion. I will only say, that, if the fact was ascertained to be so, I should feel no scruple about consenting to such an alteration of the Rubric, as might be required to render the Service more generally available.

Revision of Occasional Services.

There has also been a loud call for a Revision of the Occasional Services, on various grounds, to which I can but partially assent. That they admit of some improvement, I could not consistently deny. For in my Charge of 1854 I suggested one which I thought desirable in the Preface of the Confirmation Office. And I am happy to see that a like remark has been recently made by one whose station and character entitle his opinion to far greater weight than is due to mine.* But this and the changes which have been proposed in the Office of Matrimony, for the purpose of adapting it to the refinement of modern ears, whatever may be their value, are certainly of little moment in comparison with those which are demanded on grounds touching the conscience in some of the other Offices. It behoves us no doubt to treat all conscientious scruples and objections with tenderness and respect. But it is as little consistent with real tenderness and respect to admit, as to reject them without

* "Thoughts on the proposed Revision of the Liturgy. A Charge delivered by Richard Whately, D.D., Archbishop of Dublin. 1860." P. 8.

examination. Our first duty toward those who entertain them, is to satisfy ourselves whether they are well founded. Whether the fact, that offence has been taken at some portions of the Occasional Services, is a sufficient reason for altering them, may be difficult to decide. The only question on which I am now concerned to express an opinion, is how far they give just cause of offence.

Memorial on the Burial Office.

The case which has called forth the loudest complaint, and from persons entitled to the utmost respect, and which may therefore be considered as the strongest, is that of the Burial Office. In the year 1851 it was the subject of a Memorial addressed to the Archbishops and Bishops of the Provinces of Canterbury and York, and signed by nearly 4000 Clergymen. It "expressed their conviction that the almost indiscriminate use of the Order for the Burial of the Dead, as practically enforced by the existing state of the Law, imposes a heavy burden upon the consciences of the Clergy, and is the occasion of a grievous scandal to many Christian people:" and it prayed that the Bishops would give to the subject such attention as the magnitude of these evils appears to require, with a view to the devising of some effectual remedy. The answer returned by the Primate, after consultation with a large assembly of Bishops, stated that they "generally sympathized with the Memorialists in the difficulties to which they sometimes find themselves exposed with reference to the terms of the Service," but "that the obstacles in the way of remedying those difficulties appeared to them, as at present advised, to be insuperable."

Misconstruction of the Primate's reply.

I am afraid that to many minds this statement has conveyed a very erroneous impression, without which it never would have been brought forward, as it has been, as one of the most cogent arguments for the revision of the Prayer Book. It has been construed as an admission, not only that there was a grievance which called for sympathy, but that the origin of that grievance lay in the Prayer Book. I do not pretend to say—I cannot remember—what were the views of the majority of those by whom the subject was discussed. But I am

sure that the existence of a grievance might have been admitted by every one, though he did not hold the Prayer Book at all responsible for it, and therefore saw "obstacles," which "appeared insuperable," "in the way of remedying it." The grievance consists, partly in the relaxation of ecclesiastical discipline, and partly in the license assumed by Juries on Coroners' Inquests in cases of suicide: both causes not unfrequently leading to the result, that the Burial Service is read over persons for whom it was not designed according to the intention of the Church. But in the very worst of these cases the reading of the Service is only the sign of an evil, which would remain unabated by any change that could be made in the language of the Office. Persons who had forfeited their title to visible communion with the Church might still continue to enjoy its privileges. They might still be "the occasion of grievous scandal to many Christian people" in their lifetime: and it is only because of this that they are so after their death. If the Bishops are not able "to devise an effectual remedy" for this evil, it seems to me rather hard that they should on that account be reproached with a lack of faith, hope, and charity,* and charged with "a determination to oppose every change." The scandal occasioned by the exposure of that relaxed state of discipline without which there could be no ground of complaint, would probably not be considered by any one as a sufficient reason why the Church should cease to use the language of faith, hope, and charity, over her departed children. The only question that could well be raised is, whether, for the sake of preventing that scandal, it would be expedient to invest the clergyman with authority, either to withhold the Office, or to alter its language, at his discretion. And I must own that, in my opinion, the advantage of occasionally throwing a thin veil over a glaring

* In a letter addressed to the editor of the *Daily News* by the Rev. C. N. Wodehouse, late Canon of Norwich, which has been reprinted along with the memorial, Mr. Wodehouse says, "I can never read without sorrow the answer returned in 1851 to about 4000 Clergy, requesting relief as to the Burial Service, when the Bishops of our Protestant Church 'generally sympathizing with the memorialists,' yet deemed the obstacles to a remedy 'insuperable.' Where were faith, hope, and charity when such a decision was adopted?"

fact, would be very dearly purchased by the manifold inconveniences which would attend such an innovation.

With regard to the alleged burden on the consciences of the Clergy, the case appears to me still clearer. There is only one supposition on which I can understand why any clergyman should feel his conscience burdened, when he is constrained to read the Service over one whom he believes to have, morally though not legally, forfeited the privileges of communion with the Church; and that supposition appears to me utterly erroneous. It is that the minister, when he uses the language of the Church, is pronouncing his own private judgment on the state of the deceased. That is a view which I think no clergyman need or ought to take of this part of his office. In his ministerial capacity, he is actually responsible for nothing but compliance with the directions of the Rubric. But if he was armed with a discretionary power of altering the language of the Service, according to the view which he takes of the character and condition of the deceased, he would be charged with a responsibility, which he would often find burdensome indeed.

Conscientious objections of the Clergy.

So again, without pronouncing what amount of concession may be due to that which I might consider as a groundless objection, I may say that my own sense of fitness would lead me to deprecate, rather than desire, any change in the present form of Ordination of Priests, and very decidedly to prefer it to that which was proposed by the Royal Commissioners in 1689, by which the whole would have been cast in the form of a prayer. The restriction of our Lord's words to the office and work of a Priest, seems to me sufficient to preclude the supposition that the use of them on this occasion implies a claim to any greater power than is indispensable for the legitimate conveyance of a spiritual authority. Such an authority our present form purports to bestow absolutely, so that the effects of its lawful exercise in the dispensation of the Word and Sacraments—as our twenty-sixth Article teaches—"is not taken away," nor "the grace of God's gifts diminished," from the faithful and worthy recipient by "the unworthiness of the minister." But the

Ordination of Priests.

doctrine of the Article itself assumes, that the authority may be duly conferred on one who does not receive along with it any measure of sanctifying influence, and thus it marks the limit of the power which the Church attributes to her chief Pastors in the act of Ordination. Nor, indeed, can I believe that there has ever been any real misunderstanding of her intention in this respect, even among those who most strongly object to the language she employs. And it would not, I think, be a gain, to part with the solemn words which at such a moment raise the thoughts of the candidate to the fountain head of spiritual life and strength, and encourage him to look for a gift, which, though it cannot be imparted to him by any act of a human will, will assuredly be vouchsafed to him in proportion to the earnestness and fervour with which he seeks it.

Absolution in Visitation of the Sick.

A like remark applies even more forcibly to the Form of Absolution in the Office for the Visitation of the Sick. Unless the Prayer Book is to be subject to a different rule of interpretation from all other books, and the mind of the Church is to be gathered, not from the whole tenor of her language, but from single words or sentences detached from their context, I do not see how that form can leave room for a serious and honest doubt as to its meaning, or be fairly considered as setting up a claim to any larger authority than that which, in the General Absolution, is asserted to have been given by God to His Ministers,—one expressly limited in both forms by the conditions of faith and repentance, which are required of every one who is to derive any comfort from it.

Athanasian Creed.

That I may not seem to avoid any debatable ground within the range of this subject, I will add a few words on the Athanasian Creed. There are some—but probably a comparatively small number—who would wish that we should follow the example of the American Church, and omit the Creed altogether in our public services. On this head it may not be uninteresting to compare the opinion of a distinguished foreigner, whom no one will suspect of any leaning to mediæval or High Church views. "Of all the reformed Churches," he says, "those

of England and Scotland are those in which the Symbol of Faith plays the most important part. The noble symbols of the Church of the fourth century (the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds) form part of the Anglican Service, and perhaps it is to be regretted that there is not some stated time of the year when the Thirty-nine Articles themselves should be read publicly in Church. This importance attached to doctrine in the Church of England, is what saves her. Without this, she would have fallen ere now under the blows, not of rationalism, but of traditionalism and superstition."*

Its damnatory sentences.

Others, who prize the formulary as an exposition of doctrine, take offence at the damnatory sentences. They grated on Baxter's ears, though he fully accepted the Creed itself. But he would have been content to see them retained, if only modestly expounded. He therefore thought that they admitted of an exposition which would clear away all ground of reasonable offence. And for that purpose it seems only necessary to understand, that they do not commit any one to the assertion, that there can be no saving faith without either an intelligent or unintelligent, an explicit or implicit, assent to every particular in such a statement of the highest mystery of our belief. And when they are thus limited to the substance of the baptismal profession, there is nothing really harder in them than in our Lord's repeated declarations as to the necessity of faith.† If, therefore, the Church did right in directing the public recitation of the Creed, it is not clear that she would have done better if she had omitted those clauses. She might well shrink from mutilating a document of such venerable antiquity. But if any one is loth to give utterance to such awful language with regard to his fellow-men, that,

* Merle d'Aubigné, "Trois Siècles de Luttes en Ecosse," p. 13: "De toutes les Eglises de la Réformation, celles d'Angleterre et d'Ecosse sont celles où le symbole de la foi joue le rôle le plus important. Les beaux symboles de l'Eglise du ive siècle (ceux de Nicée et d'Athanase) font partie du culte Anglican, et peut-être est il à regretter qu'il n'y ait pas quelque époque de l'année où les Trente-neuf Articles mêmes soient lus publiquement dans l'Eglise. Cette importance donnée à la doctrine dans l'Eglise d'Angleterre est ce qui la sauve. Sans cela elle serait déjà tombée sous les coups, non du rationalisme, mais du traditionalisme et de la superstition."

† Mark xvi. 16. John iii. 18, 36.

I think, is a feeling very much to be encouraged. It is most desirable that every one who pronounces it should be thinking, not of others, but of himself; and should make it an occasion for questioning his own heart, whether *he* has kept the deposit of his baptismal faith *whole and undefiled.* It might then not be foreign to the use of edifying.

Real aim of the proposed Revision.

But it is evident that, whatever may be the value of the changes we have been considering, and whatever other purpose they might answer, they would be wholly ineffectual for that which has been put forward as the main end of the proposed Revision, and which indeed is so important, that those who believe it to be attainable cannot be satisfied with any thing short of it. For it is nothing less than the promotion of peace and harmony within the Church, and the reconciliation of many who are aliens from our communion. But the revision which would be required for this purpose must be applied above all to those portions of the Prayer Book which bear most directly on the theological controversies agitated between different parties in the Church. The one party desires to see the book purged of passages which seem to countenance doctrinal views which it believes to be erroneous; not however because it considers these passages as binding any member or minister of the Church to the acceptance of those views; for that would be inconsistent with its standing in the Church; nor again because it believes that the removal or alteration of those passages would or could have the effect of bringing its own views into accordance with those of its opponents; for this is manifestly impossible; nor again because it even professes to wish that its opponents should be compelled either to renounce their opinions, or to withdraw from the ministry at least, if not from the communion of the Church. The change which it seeks is not, as it assures us, designed for the purpose of aggression, but simply of self-protection. It is not however from any danger which threatens its position in the Church that it needs to be protected, nor from any hardship to which it has not voluntarily subjected itself. If it ever complains of "the difficulties of an honest and conscientious

use of the Book of Common Prayer,"* this complaint, in the mouth of ministers of the Church, must of course be understood to mean, not the reality, but only the appearance of an impediment.

Such being the case, if the advocates of such change ask for the concurrence of their brethren in the ministry who hold different views, it would seem that their language must amount nearly to this: "You and we have been long ministering in the same Church, and using the same formularies, to which we have both given our deliberate assent. But, generally excellent as they are, there are some things in them which we wish to amend, not of course because they are decidedly false and wrong, but because they appear to countenance certain views of doctrine which you perhaps adopt, but which are widely different from ours. We do not indeed complain that they subject us to any outward molestation, or that they impose any restraint on our freedom of thought or speech. But they are disagreeable to our feelings. In many of us they excite painful misgivings, which in some instances have become so intolerable as to constrain conscientious men to go out from us. The changes which we propose will to us be a most welcome relief. To you they must be a matter of indifference, as you will continue to hold and to teach the same doctrine as before." The answer to this might be: "We are content with things as they are. We have no wish to disturb your position, but we desire to maintain our own. And we think it would be materially damaged, if the Church should alter her formularies expressly on the ground that they appear to lend her sanction to our views." I must own that I see nothing unreasonable in this language; and I think there is reason to believe that it expresses the sentiments of a very large body, if not of the great majority, of the Clergy; at least of the Ten Thousand who signed the Declaration I was speaking of; but probably of many more,

The argument for such Revision.

The reply.

* "Thoughts on the Liturgy. The Difficulties of an Honest and Conscientious Use of the Book of Common Prayer considered as a Loud and Reasonable Call for the only Remedy, Revision. By the Rev. Philip Gell, M.A., sometime Rural Dean, and Minister of St. John's, Derby."

who, however they might wish for some kind of change, would have agreed with them in deprecating any which affected matters of doctrine.

But if the majority, or even something less than a majority of the Clergy, have, whether rightly or wrongly, made up their minds on this point, it might seem that, for any practical purpose, there must be an end of the question; and that with regard to this part of the subject the appointment of a Royal Commission could lead to no useful result, but would be very likely to give occasion to fresh dissension. Unhappily, however, it appears that the advocates of such changes are not disposed to allow their brethren who differ from them, whether few or many, any voice in the matter, but desire to call in the aid of the State to overpower their opposition, and to impose, what they would consider as a deteriorated Prayer Book, upon them.* And it is still more to be lamented that the noble leader of the movement, notwithstanding his professions of respect for the wishes of the Clergy, has thrown out a significant hint, that their consent is not a necessary condition of the innovations which he contemplates.† Indeed, if it was, he could hardly have failed to take some notice of the question, which was very distinctly brought under his consideration in the debate of 1858, as to the competency of Convocation, as at present constituted, to deal with measures of such a nature. On the last occasion he passed over that question in silence. Nor does it appear that he has formed any opinion upon it, farther than to invite attention to a scheme which has been proposed for superseding the action of Convocation by assemblies of the Clergy, to be held in every Rural Deanery, to deliberate on the acceptance of

Proposal for State interference.

And for superseding Convocation.

* Rev. P. Gell, in the pamphlet above cited, p. 50: "It is competent to the Royal Authority thus to alter the Prayer Book, so as to correct the errors and heresies complained of (Parliament not objecting) without further trouble."

† "When the Commissioners have made their report it will no doubt be submitted to Convocation, and, if approved by that body, then to the Imperial Parliament. *Unquestionably it would be competent for Her Majesty to omit Convocation altogether;* but I sincerely trust that, for reasons which I gave on a former occasion, such a policy will not be recommended."—Lord Ebury's Speech in the House of Lords, 8th May, 1860.

any changes which the Royal Commissioners may recommend to be made in the Prayer Book.*

It may indeed be hoped that such a violent course of proceeding as that to which I was just now adverting would be disavowed, and with some degree of indignation, by moderate men of all parties in the Church. But I am not aware that this has yet been done by any of those who share the author's theological views. And it is somewhat startling even to see such a proposal made in print by a clergyman, but still more to find it apparently noticed, with a very faint expression of dissent, by the leader of the movement in Parliament. This fact alone would, as it appears to me, be sufficient both to explain and justify the opposition which the movement has encountered; and I venture to predict, that this opposition will continue unabated, as long as both the ultimate object, and the means by which it is to be accomplished, shall remain involved in their present obscurity. Deprecation of it.

I will only add, that I consider it as matter for congratulation, that the Prayer Book has been cleared of some State Services, which had become nearly obsolete, and had been framed in a spirit, in which it was neither possible nor desirable that they should be any longer used.

I also regard it as an important and hopeful event, that Her Majesty has been advised, in compliance with the prayer of Convocation, to grant Her Royal License for a reconsideration of the Twenty-ninth Canon; though the preparation of the License was found to be attended with difficulties, which prevented it from being issued in time to enable Convocation to enter upon the discussion of the subject in the last Session. It would be premature for the present to touch on the merits of the question itself, in its theological, practical, or legal aspect; on the reasons which have been urged for or against an alteration of the Canon, or the objections which have been raised to the dealing with it in a Provincial Convocation, or even a National Synod. I The twenty-ninth canon.

* "Liturgical Revision Illustrated and Vindicated on Orthodox Principles. By the Rev. C. H. Davis, M.A., of Wadham College, Oxford, Chaplain to the Stroud Union. *With an Introduction by Lord Ebury.*"

anticipate no harm, but rather much good from the ventilation of these points. But whatever may be the issue in this case, the precedent of the Royal License seems to me a decided gain, and, if I am not too sanguine, marks the beginning of an auspicious era in the History of the Church.

The length at which I have been led to dwell on the various questions we have been considering, has, I feel, occupied as much of your attention as I have a right to claim on this occasion; not however, I trust, more than is due to the importance of their bearing on the welfare of the Church, and the exercise of our ministry. All that remains for me to say, regards the practical conclusion. I have already intimated, that the aspect of our times appears to me to show an urgent and increasing need of a closer union among Churchmen, for the purpose of defence against the manifold aggression with which we are threatened. This need has been very widely felt, and has given rise to several associations, some of a more general, some of a more special nature. I believe that it must be, not merely a temporary, but a permanent gain to the Church—one far greater than any occasional benefit which may result from such association—that her members, of all orders and degrees, should be awakened to a livelier sense of their mutual relations, and their common interests. It has been with a view to that end, that I have so often insisted on the advantage of periodical meetings for conference and deliberation among the Clergy, and I rejoice to know that such conferences have been growing more frequent, and to believe that, wherever they have been tried, they have been found both pleasant and profitable. The clergyman who is most fully occupied with his parochial duties, and whose heart and soul are most in his work, will be likely to gain, as well as to impart, most in this kind of intercourse with his brethren.

Necessity for union.

But clerical meetings, however useful for many purposes, could not of themselves, to whatever extent they might be multiplied, answer that which is at present most important, of providing for the security of the Church from the dangers with which she is

threatened. It is only by the co-operation of the Clergy and the Laity that she can be enabled to maintain her ground. We are therefore plainly bound to avail ourselves of all the means within our reach for the promotion of that object. All occasions which bring the Clergy and Laity together, as Churchmen and in the service of the Church, are valuable on that account, independently of the special end. And I consider the multiplication of such occasions as one of the happiest effects which have resulted from that new organization of our Archidiaconal Boards which I announced in my last Charge, and which I am happy to say has, both in this respect, and in the increase of funds, and the impulse given to the cause of education throughout the Diocese, more than fulfilled the hope which I then expressed.

Co-operation of Clergy and Laity.

I therefore heartily sympathize with the general spirit and aim of an association which has been recently organized, mainly through the indefatigable exertions of one zealous friend of the Church, under the name of the Church Institution, for the purpose of combining and concentrating the efforts of Churchmen throughout the country for the defence of the Church, and the general promotion of her welfare, so as to give them full efficiency. I do not hesitate to say, that I think this institution worthy of all the support it can receive, and that I should be glad to hear that many local associations of Clergy and Laity in this diocese had affiliated themselves to it. There is only one point in its constitution as to which I feel some doubt and misgiving. And this is the formation of a Central Council, to be composed of representatives of the affiliated associations, and to hold meetings, not less than four times a year in London. This machinery appears at first sight so cumbrous and costly, that it could only be justified by the clearest proof of its necessity. But hitherto I have seen nothing to satisfy me that it is likely to answer any useful purpose. Some friends of the Church whose opinion is entitled to the highest respect, believe that it is not only useless but mischievous and dangerous.* The reason which

The Church Institution.

* "A Letter from J. C. Colqhoun, Esq., to Henry Hoare, Esq."

has been assigned for this opinion is, that, while the local (Ruridecanal or District) Associations are composed of persons united by a common object, though perhaps differing in their views on several important questions, the representative chosen by each of such bodies, would represent, as it has been expressed, "not three or four shades of opinion, but the opinion of the majority, or a neutral tint in which all the different sections may be content to acquiesce." I am not sure that there is any real ground for this objection. If there was, that would seem to imply that the object of the institution, as a whole, was one different in kind from that of each of the local associations, and one as to which there might be a difference of opinion, corresponding to the variety of parties in the Church.

Objects of the Association.

Now it is true the institution describes itself as an "Association of Clergy and Laity for defensive and general purposes." But one of its Rules is, "that no question touching doctrine shall be entertained at any Meeting;" and I had understood this as equivalent to a disavowal of every object which could stir or interest any party feeling. It appears however, that it has not been so interpreted by all, and has thus left room for jealousy, which, if I had not so understood it, I should have thought perfectly just and reasonable. Its existence shows the need of some more precise definition of the purposes of the institution, or of some Rule more expressly excluding every kind of party question. In the meanwhile, having been consulted by some of the Clergy and Laity, who proposed to associate themselves with the Church Institution, I recommended that they should connect themselves with it for every purpose of correspondence and co-operation, but should abstain from choosing a representative, to take part in the meetings of the Central Council, until their object should be more distinctly ascertained. I believe that those with whom I conferred on the subject were satisfied as to the expediency of this course, and it is that which I should still counsel as the safest and best.

I will conclude with a single word of caution, which will be at the same time one of brotherly exhortation and comfort. I have

alluded to dangers, evident enough to us all, which threaten the Church; that is, not her existence, not her stability—for that we believe to rest on a foundation which can never fail—but a great part of the means and advantages with which she has been providentially entrusted for the carrying on of her work. We are bound, one and all, to do our utmost to preserve them unimpaired, as well as to use them faithfully, so far as each of us has any share of them committed to his stewardship. The signs of the times loudly admonish us of the special need in which we stand of watchfulness and activity, of mutual concert and co-operation. It would be a mark, either of indifference or of presumptuous confidence in any of us, to stand aloof from the efforts which are made by our brethren in behalf of the common cause. But it does not follow that we overrate the value of any earthly means, or place undue reliance on any arm of flesh. We may and ought still to be looking beyond all to the Great Head of the Church, as the sole ultimate ground of our trust; and it is only in that thought that any of us who may be disposed to take a gloomy view of our present prospects, will be able to find any solid comfort. But the condition and the measure of such comfort will be the diligence with which each gives himself to the duties of his ministry; the right he has, in all humility, and with a deep sense of manifold shortcomings, to hope for a share of the Divine blessing on his work. Whoever earnestly strives to earn that right, will assuredly not be disappointed of his hope. And, however humble and obscure may be the field of his labours, it may be found at the Great Day, that he has contributed as much as any to bring down a blessing on the Church.

Conclusion.

END OF VOL. I.

INDEX.

A.

Act of Submission, i. 214; obscurity of, 215; character of, ib.; principle of, 216.
Age, spirit of the, i. 50.
Anglo-Saxon Church, i. 203, &c.
Apostolical succession, different views of, i. 38; relation to the doctrine of the Sacraments, ib.; opinion of Dr. Arnold, of Rugby, 39; doubtful use of, in controversy, 40.
Aquinas, doctrine of transubstantiation, i. 241, 249, 250.
Archdeacons, visitations of, i. 147.
Arnold, Dr., of Rugby, quoted, i. 39, 49.
Article, the Eleventh, i. 32; the Twenty-second, 44.
Articles, the Thirty-nine, a standard of orthodoxy, i. 240; their literal and grammatical sense, i. 42; framed to admit different views, 43; Dr. Newman's application of the principle, ib.; their relation to the Prayer Book, i. 113.
Athanasius, on the Nicene Creed, ii. 351.
Athanasian Creed, the, i. 394, 395; ii. 317; the practical question, ii. 318; the Church has power to regulate the use of it, 319; history of, 320; characteristics of the, 325; damnatory clauses of the, differently explained, 322, 323; said to be misunderstood, 327; explanations of them not generally accepted, ib.; compromise suggested, 328; only affect the laity, ib.; mode of conducting the controversy deprecated, 329.

B.

Babbage, Prof., on Miracles, ii. 88.
Baptism, sacrament of, i. 114, &c.; benefit conveyed by, 115; tendency of opposite views concerning, 116; teaching of St. Augustine, and of the Church of Rome, 158.
Baptism, infant, i. 155, &c.; the case of baptised infants dying in infancy, 158; remission of original sin in, 168; prevenient grace, i. 156, 157.
Baptism, Calvin's doctrine of, i. 157; singularity of Mr. Gorham's tenet respecting, 158; objection to the doctrine of baptismal grace, 159; conditional or unconditional efficacy of, i. 160; bearing of the view taken of it upon the work of Christian education, ib.; Hammond's view of, 161, 166, 169; doctrine of the Church catechism, 162; statements of Bishop Blomfield and Bishop Bethell, ib.; notion of a covenant essential to, maintained by Hooker and Hammond, 166; Bishop Wilson and Thorndike, 167.
Bellarmine, *De Eucharistia*, i. 250.
Bellarmine, doctrine of transubstantiation, ii. 285, 286.
Bennett case, the, ii. 312; charitable interpretations of the Court, 314.
Berengarius, i. 331, 341.
Bevan Charity, the, i. 313.
Bible, relation of religion to the, ii. 79; history of the, 82; what is essential in, 83.
Bilingual difficulty, the, in Wales, i. 8.
Birmingham, King Edward's School at, i. 364.
Bishops, being Privy Councillors, should be members of the Court of Appeal, i. 172; but should not be the only judges of doctrine, 173.
Bishops, conduct of, with regard to Ritualism, ii. 148, 149; at the time of the Restoration, 151.
Bishops, address of, to the clergy of both provinces, ii. 147.
Bishoprics, appointments to, ii. 345.
Bowstead, Mr., his Report on the Schools in the Principality, i. 366, &c.
Bull, Bishop, his doctrine of justification, i. 33.
Burials Bill, the, ii. 337; inconsistency of its supporters, 338.
Burial office, memorial on the, i. 391; conscientious difficulties of the clergy, 393.
Butler's, Rev. W. Archer, Letters on Development, i. 186.

C.

Canon, the twenty-ninth, i. 399.
Casaubon, his rebuke of Cardinal Baronius, ii. 150.
Catechism, the, i. 112.
Catechism, Church, how regarded by Dissenters, i. 373; proper use of, 374.
Cathedral of St. David's, restoration of the, ii. 93, 94; 258, 259; 340.
Catholic Church, appeal to the, irrelevant to a question of Anglican orthodoxy, ii. 72.
Catholic teaching, that which is so called is at variance with the mind of the Church of England, i. 266.
Choral associations, formation of, ii. 156.
Christ, character of, ii. 25; divinity of, 28; human and divine knowledge of, 76; difficulty of the question, 77; attempt of Lower House of Convocation to settle it, ib.
Church, a free, ii. 142.
Church and State, relations between, ii. 206; union of, ii. 141.
Church, aspect of, externally, ii. 2; internally, 3; evils in the, i. 4; hopes of improvement, i. 6; evils not inherent in her system, i. 7; distinction between, and a school of philosophy, ii. 52; ideal of a national, 54; divisions in the, i. 87; influence of the, ii. 153; services of the, not sufficiently attractive, 154; remedies suggested, ib.; importance of a study of the Primitive, ii. 185; Church of the Catacombs and the Church of the Vatican, 187; of England and of Rome, 188; work of the, i. 190; spirit in which it should be done, 192; power of the State to sever its connection with the, ii. 218; prospects of the, i. 229, 247.
Church Defence Institution, ii. 342.
Church doctrine, popular expositions of, i. 13.
Churches built and restored, i. 143; improved architecture of, 144; condition of, in the diocese, i. 195, 196; restoration of, ii. 341; repair of, i. 9, ii. 258.
Churches and chapels, alienation of the masses from, ii. 43; prospect of winning the irreligious class, 45.
Churches and schools, building of, in the diocese, i. 309.
Church establishments, no express guidance in Scripture on, ii. 214; complication of the question, 215; movements affecting, 216; State countenance of, ib.; neither absolutely good nor bad, 217.
Church Institution, the, ii. 129.
Church in Wales, the, ii. 34.
Church of England, aspect of, i. 349; contentions in the, i. 262; present condition of the, i. 151, 152; prospects of, ii. 304; fear of disorganization in, 305; Romanizing tendencies in, i. 183; compared with Church of Rome, i. 106; the true life of, 108.
Church of Rome, secessions to, i. 184; groundless nature of them, ib.; her special advantages, i. 106, 107; has forbidden or discouraged the reading of Scripture, ii. 5; language used in the Oxford Tracts respecting, i. 46; change of feeling towards, 47; charged with idolatry, i. 77, 78; controversy with, reduced to a single point, 104; vitality of the, ii. 264; character of, 265, 266; improvement in, since the Council of Trent, 269; her policy changed since the Council of Trent, ii. 273; spirit in which she should be regarded, 274.
Church order, value of, i. 18, 19.
Church principles, danger of neglecting, i. 16.
Church property, alienation of, ii. 219.
Church rates, i. 349; Report of Committee of the House of Lords on, 350; Abolition Bill passed in the Commons, 351; defeated in the Lords, 352; fallacy of conscientious objection to, 353; abolition of, ii. 97; state of the question, ii. 96; Braintree case, i. 231; motives for resisting, 233; objection to compulsion, 234; mode of levying, ib.; argument drawn from contests about, i. 355; concessions on this head will not satisfy Nonconformists, 356; amount levied by, ib.; effects of the cessation of, ib.; Report of the Select Committee on, 358; a commutation recommended, ib.; proposal for exemption, ib.; its probable effects, 359; agitation on the subject due to the Liberation Society, 360; ulterior ends in view, 361.
Church reform, ii. 344, &c.; an organic change probable, 346; reconstruction of the representative system most important, ib.
Church societies, support of, i. 315; withdrawal of Queen's Letters, i. 316; origin of it, ib., false pretences of the Declaration by which it was obained, 317-319.
Clergy, conduct of the, i. 109; deficient supply of, i. 146; deficiency of, i. 7; importance of frequent intercourse and concert, i. 11; relation of, to the Crown, i. 211; report on discipline of the, 221; supply of, i. 225; the parochial, ought to be adequately provided for, i. 84.
Clergy Discipline Bill, i. 109, &c.
Clergymen, liberty of, in matters of opinion, ii. 36; resignation of, ii. 340.
Clerical court, impracticability of, ii. 310.
Clerical meetings, i. 13, i. 230; peculiarity

of, in Wales, i. 14; borrowed from Dissent, 15.
Cobb, Mr., on Reunion, &c., ii. 261; Romish doctrine, 275; the Jesuits, 277; transubstantiation, 281, &c.
Colenso, Bishop, publications of, ii. 59; committee of Lower House of Convocation, 61; his official position gave currency to his work, 62; effects of his mode of publication, 63; tone of his language, ib.; its assumption, 64; relation of his book to the doctrines of the Church of England, 65; action of Convocation, 66; mode of dealing with propositions extracted from the book, 70-80; remarks on the study of the work, 80-81; trial of, a mockery, ii. 143.
Collections, weekly, i. 320.
Communion office, the English, and the Romish mass, ii. 233; compared, 244; English and Scotch compared, i. 278; principal difference between, 279; Bishop Horsley's opinion, 280; omission of prayer of invocation in the English office, 281; language of the Scotch office not free from ambiguity, 282; Romish and English contrasted, ii. 161.
Communion Service, in second book of Edward VI., i. 243; ante-communion office, 244.
Confirmation, age at which the rite should be administered, ii. 127; instruction with a view to, i. 23; opposition to, i. 236; connection of the Catechism and, ib.; title of the office of, in Edward VI.'s Prayer Book, ib.; the office may be revised with advantage, 237; early preparation for, 238.
Conscience Clause, the, ii. 104; vehement denunciation of, 105; nature of discussions on, 106; Prof. Plumptre on, ib.; ground of opposition to, 107; view taken of it by the committee of the National Society, 108; weakness of their argument, 109; principles at stake in the dispute, 110; alleged violation of compact, 111, and interference with religious instruction in Church schools, 113; charged with insinuating principles of secular education into denominational schools, 115; is a necessary safeguard, 121; perpetuation of, 121.
Convocation, revival of, i. 174, 198; has not been either national or representative, 175; dangers besetting the revival, ib.; objects contemplated by it secured already, 177; further powers aimed at, 179; not properly representative, 199; the work of, 202; history of, i. 203, &c.; first session of, 209; twofold aspect of, ib.; original character of, 212; extension of, the term, 213; parliamentary, ib.; Act of Submission, 214; facilities afforded to, 216; right of clergy to return members to, 217; rights of the Lower House of, ib.; why it meets simultaneously with parliament, 218; suspension of its deliberations, ib.; inaction of, 219; duties of a revived, 220; advantages to be derived from, ib.; character of proceedings, 221; committee on the constitution of, 222; joint deliberation of the two provinces, 223; representation of the laity, ib.; limits within which its functions can be exercised, 224; jealousy of, on the part of the State, 226; present state and prospects of, ib.; capacities of, for good, 228; change of opinion respecting, 286; unable to effect needful changes, 288; expression of opinion on books, ii. 66; first judgment of, since its revival, 67; its effects, 68; its judgment on theological works should be dogmatical, 69; dealing of the committee with the first proposition in Bishop Colenso's work, 70; with the second, 72; report of Lower House on the work not sanctioned by the Upper House, 74; its dealing with the third proposition of the Bishop's book, 75; fails to touch the real point at issue, ib.; dealing with the fourth proposition concerning our Lord's divine knowledge, 76, 77; serious omissions in the report, 78; reform of, 139; vindication of, 140; does not adequately express the mind of the Church, 347.
Cosin, Bishop, "History of Transubstantiation," i. 332.
Council of Trent, i. 44, 45; the history of the, ii. 265.
Councils, general, ii. 141.
Court of Appeal, constitution of, i. 172, 173; ii. 132; substitution of a purely ecclesiastical tribunal for, 135; excellence of the present, 138; proposed to refer doctrinal questions to an ecclesiastical council, 137; effects of the judgments, ii. 309; judgment of, on the Eucharist, 312; judgment of the, upon Ritual, ii. 237, &c.; distasteful to the Ritualists, 239; i. 246, 247.

D.

Davies, Rev. Llewelyn, on Miracles, ii. 88.
Declaration of the clergy on the judgment in "Essays and Reviews," ii. 122; its ulterior object, 123.
Denison, Archdeacon, his doctrine of the Eucharist considered, i. 267, &c.; erroneous interpretation of the Catechism, 271; his propositions irreconcilable with one another, 272; uses language which is the technical expression of a Romish error, 273; his views of education examined, ii. 114-120.

Development, doctrine of, i. 59, 60; how applied to establish the tenets of the Church of Rome, ib.; Dr. Newman's essay on, i. 102, &c.
Diocesan Church Union Society, i. 10; Church Building Society, ii. 97.
Diocesan Inspector, appointment of, ii. 336.
Diocese of St. David's, condition of, i. 2, 4, 85, 86; neglect of Church order in the, i. 67; condition of churches in the, ii. 92; church building in, mainly carried on by voluntary contributions, 95; improvement in the, i. 142; poverty of livings in, 146.
Dioceses, subdivision of, ii. 344.
"Directorium Anglicanum," the, ii. 158.
Disestablishment of the Church of England, ii. 228; how viewed by the clergy of different schools, 229; sources of danger, 230; would involve disruption, ib.; advocacy of, by the Ritualists, ii. 310; disapproved by the bulk of the clergy, 311. (See Irish Church.)
Divorce, law of, i. 289, 290.
Doctrine, definition of, i. 171; questions of, in a court of law, ii. 134.

E.

Ecclesiastical Commission, aid to be expected from, i. 8.
Ecclesiastical Titles Bill, i. 180, 181.
Ecclesiastical Dilapidations Act, ii. 338.
Education, elementary, i. 310; committee of Welsh, ib.; religious instruction in the Principality, 311; absence of a uniform system, 312; suggested action of the Welsh bishops in order to secure uniformity, 312; insufficient and inefficient schools, 313; remedies proposed, ib.; personal superintendence of the clergy, 315; management clauses, 126; misunderstanding respecting them, 127; ii. 330; Act of 1870, ib.; injurious effect of denunciation of secular, 331; operation of the Act on religious, ib.; Nonconformist support of secular, 332; Nonconformist protest against the exclusion of the Bible, 334.
Education in the diocese, i. 128, &c.; reports of Commissioners, 129, effort for the promotion of, 135; special fund towards, 136; progress of, ii. 99.
Education of the poor, i. 19-24, 89, 235; efforts of the Church, 90; encouragements to the discharge of this duty, 91; necessity of personal exertion, 92; religious instruction, 93.
Education, national, i. 117; government control in, 118; separation of secular and religious instruction, 119, 120; importance of religious teaching, 121; misunderstanding between the advocates of the two systems, 122; action of the government, 124; requires higher qualifications in the schoolmasters, 125; opposition to the government scheme has arisen entirely without the Church, 126, 336, &c.; proceedings of Committee of Council, 369; parliamentary grant, 370; received by Dissenters in Church schools, 372, ii. 252; low state of, 253; moral and religious training, ib.; value of secular, in checking crime, 254; line drawn between secular and religious, 255; provision for, in Wales, 256; establishment of secular schools, 257; duties of clergymen towards schools, ib.
Education, secular and religious, ii. 114-116; of the children of Dissenters, 118, 119.
Education of the World, Essay on the, ii. 126.
Edward I. summons a Convocation of the Clergy, i. 208.
Endowments, poverty of, in Wales, i. 7.
Endowed Schools Bill, i. 363; legislative interference unnecessary, ib.; operation of, on national schools, 365.
English, teaching of, in Welsh schools, i. 133.
English Church Union, report of, on Ritual, ii. 172.
Error, not a crime, i. 74; distinction between teaching it and allowing it to be taught, 75.
Essays and Reviews, ii. 5; the work of one school, ii. 51; general tendency of, 53; attention attracted to, by the character of the authors, 7; obscurity in, 8; form and conditions of publication, ib.; relation of opinions expressed in, to the doctrines of the Church, 9; unity of the publication, 10; public history of the book, ib.; attitude of the Church towards, 11; the Bishops' censure of, 12-13; apology for, in the *Edinburgh Review*, 13; refutation demanded, 14; clerical contributors to, 16; object of the writers, 24; decision of the Judicial Committee on two of the contributors, ii. 122.
Establishments—see Church.
Eucharist, doctrine of the, in the Church of England, i. 262; in primitive times, 263; language of the Reformers respecting, ib.; alleged want of explicitness in the language of our Church, 264; mystical and spiritual tendencies concerning, 265; importance of the questions raised, ib.; alleged Catholic doctrine of, 266; ambiguity of terms used, 267; declaration of the Court at Bath, ib.; beginning of the controversies concerning, i. 329; frequency of celebrating, i. 242; non-communicating attendance, 243, ii. 167; receiving of, by the priest

alone, 244; opinions of Bishop Cosin and Bishop Overall respecting, ib.; relation of the controversy to that on Baptism, 283; spiritual presence of Christ in, admitted by Bellarmine, i. 332; Justin Martyr's account of the, ii. 186; minor differences between ancient and modern usage, ib.; memorial on the, ii. 241; repudiates a corporal presence, 242, and transubstantiation, ib.; and innovations on the Eucharistic Sacrifice, 243; ignores different modes of celebrating the Eucharist, 244; consistency of its statements with the doctrine of the Church, 245; words of institution in the, i. 246; adoration of the elements in the, ii. 247.
Evangelical party, i. 30.
Evangelical party have introduced no innovations, ii. 306.

F.

Figure, meaning of, i. 340.
Figura, opposed to *Veritas*, i. 336, 340.
Freeman, Archdeacon, his "Principles of Divine Service" reviewed, i. 329, &c.; his doctrine of the Eucharist, 345.

G.

Gorham *v.* the Bishop of Exeter, case of, i. 153; two questions involved, that of doctrine, and that of jurisdiction, ib.
Gorham, Mr., his view of baptism, i. 156, 158; states what baptism does not give, rather than what it does, 164; contends against the unconditional efficacy of baptism, 165.
Gorham case, interest of, ii. 135.

H.

Habits, formation of, the chief thing in education, i. 23, 123.
Haimo, i. 345.
Hammond, remarks on Preaching, i. 15.
Havelock, Sir Henry, his opinion of the Church Service, i. 354.
Heresy, clause concerning, in Clergy Discipline Bill, i. 110.
Herman, Archbishop of Cologne, doctrine of the Lord's Supper, ii. 200-202.
Hincmar supports Paschasius' view of the Eucharist, i. 345.
Holy Communion, the doctrine of the, contrasted with the Romish mass, ii. 161.
Home missions, i. 225.
Hook, Dr., Letter to the Bishop of St. David's, i. 120.
Hooker quoted, i. 47.
Horsley, Bishop, quoted, i. 33.
Hyacinthe, Father, language respecting the Papacy, ii. 276, 277.

I.

Idiology expounded, ii. 43.
Idolatry, meaning of, i. 78, 79.
Immaculate Conception, doctrine of, i. 254, &c; progress of belief in, 258; effects of its promulgation, 259; history of the, i. 322, &c.; the Pope's Circular, 323; popular ignorance abused, 325; various opinions as to the antiquity of the festival, 326; various modes of encouraging the belief in, 327; conclusions of Archbishop Sibour respecting, ib.; definition of, ii. 270.
Infallibility of the Pope, i. 256; belief in, ii. 275; real meaning of, 276; promulgation of, 291; precipitately decreed, 296; protest against, ib.; truth of the dogma, 297; novelty of the dogma, 298; assurance given that it was no part of the Catholic faith, ib.; viewed in relation to ecclesiastical history, 299; bearing on the world at large, 300; protest against, in the Church of England, 303; makes loyalty impossible to Roman Catholics for the future, 302; likely to widen the breach between us and Rome, 303.
Inspiration, not defined by the Church, i. 294.
Inspiration, different views of, ii. 50.
Intolerance, prevalence of, i. 252, 253.
Ireland, union of, with England, ii, 208; effected against the wish of the majority, 210, 288; position of, at the Reformation, 209.
Irish Church establishment, ii. 211; opinion of foreigners on its abolition, 212; theory of, ib.; attempt to vindicate, 213; effects of, on the union, ib.; method of dealing with the surplus of the property, 221; justice of disestablishment, 222; effects of the disestablishment, 223.
Irish Church, capacity of the, to maintain its ground when disestablished, ii. 224; its disestablishment viewed in relation to the English Church, 225; essential differences between the two, 226, 227.
Irish history, retrospect of, ii. 207.

J.

Jesuits, influence of the, ii. 277.
Judicial Committee of Privy Council, sentence of, not opposed to the Nicene Creed, i. 168; decision in the Gorham case, i. 170; does not sanction heresy, ib.; wisdom of the decision, 171; its rule for dealing with charges of heresy, ii. 73.
Judicial decisions, bearing of, on theological works, ii. 15; on the character of the Church, ib.
Justification, doctrine of, i. 32, 34.

K.

Kneeling, the declaration on, ii. 248, 284.

L.

Laborde, L'Abbé, his work on the Immaculate Conception, i. 255.
Laity, co-operation of, to be secured by the clergy, i. 10; regarded the Oxford movement with alarm, i. 61; admission of, to Synods, ii. 124; recognised in the *Reformatio Legum*, 125; difficulty of securing a representation of, ib.; exclusion of, from doctrinal decisions, 133.
Lanfranc, *De Corpore et Sanguine Domini*, i. 238.
Lay co-operation, i. 225.
Lessing on the Relation of the Bible to Religion, ii. 78.
Liberation Society, the, i. 360; its objects, 361; its mode of operation, 362.
Libraries and reading societies, i. 13.
Liturgy, importance of, i. 16; revision of the, i. 65; rendered necessary by lapse of time, 66; proposed, 374; rejection of motion for a Royal Commission, 375; causes of the rejection, 376; the question at issue, 377; alteration made on the second motion, 378; attempt to ascertain whether the clergy desired a renewal of the motion, 379; declaration against revision signed by 10,000 of the clergy, 379, 389; opinion of Convocation, 381; statement respecting it erroneous, ib.; Convocation not inconsistent, 382; nor the Bishop, 384, 385; how far desirable, ib.; provision for special services, i. 383; shortening of the Morning Service, 386, 390; circumstances to be taken into account, ib.; retrenchment of repetition, 387; administration of Holy Communion, 389; occasional services, 390; memorial on the Burial Office, 391; Ordination of Priests, 393; Visitation of the Sick, 394; Athanasian Creed, ib.; real aim of proposed revision, 396; arguments for, 397; proposal for State interference, 398, and for superseding Convocation, ib.; deprecation of such measures, 399; the 29th Canon, ib.; proposed "purification" of, i. 283; pretext for, 284; if attempted, would prevent beneficial changes, 285; attempt to conform it to the Romish mass, ii. 159.
Liturgy, need of a, felt by Nonconformists, i. 242; and by German Protestants, ib.
Livings, augmentation of small, by the Bishop, i. 150.
Lord's Supper, change in the administration of the, ii. 158. (See also Eucharist.)

M.

M'Coll, Mr., his reckless charges against Bishop Jeremy Taylor, and Bishop Thirlwall, ii. 352, 353.
Mass, Sacrifice of the, i. 245, ii. 193, &c., 199; service of the, i. 78; the doctrine of the, ii. 168. (See also Transubstantiation, Real Presence, Eucharist.)
Masses, origin of solitary, ii. 168.
Mariolatry, impulse given to, by the title Θεοτόκος, ii. 32.
Maynooth Grant, i. 69, &c.; inconsistency of opposition to it, i. 73, 74; an act of justice, 80; likely to do not harm, but good, ib.; a reversal of a mischievous policy, 81; its probable results, ib.
Medd, Mr., on the Eucharistic Sacrifice, ii. 193.
Ministry, practical hints for the, i. 50, 51.
Miracles, denial of, ii. 16; bearing of, upon our Lord's person, 22; accepted for the sake of the moral lesson, 31; argument from, ii. 86, &c.
Missionary work, i. 95.
Morley, Mr. S., on Church Rates, i. 360, 361.
Mortara case, the, ii. 120.
Mosaic Cosmogony, essay on the, ii. 49.
Music, vocal, importance of, in education, i. 21.

N.

Natal, Bishop of, see Colenso.
National church, theory of, in Essays and Reviews, ii. 37-40; Calvinistic opinions adverse to, 42; drift of the theory, 47.
National schools in Wales, improvement in, i. 139. (See Education.)
Neology of the day, inquiry into, ii. 4.
Newman, Dr. J. H., i. 32.
Nicene Creed, objections to the, met by Athanasius, ii. 321.
Non-communicating attendance, ii. 167.
Nonconformists, relation of, to National schools, ii. 109; protest of, against the exclusion of the Bible from elementary schools, ii. 333, 334; practice of, with regard to subscription to formularies, ii. 59; recognition by, of the need of a Liturgy, i. 242.
Nonconformity, changed aspect of, i. 5; its hostility to the Church, ib.; prevalence of, i. 2; how to be accounted for, i. 3; in many respects salutary, ib.
Norris, Canon, on Religious Education, ii. 255.
North side of the table, argument on the, ii. 149, 150.

O.

Objective, meaning of the word, ii. 242.
Offertory, i. 68.
Old Catholics, relation of, to our own Church, ii. 303.
Opinion, freedom of, in the Church, i. 49.
Ordination of Priests, i. 393.
Ornaments Rubric, ii. 158, 235.

Oxford movement, the, its alleged tendency to Romanism, i. 56.
Oxford Tracts, i. 24.

P.

Papacy, position of the, i. 348.
Papal prerogative, the, ii. 266, 276.
Parishes, wide extent of, i. 8.
Parsonage houses, the Bishop's fund for the building of, ii. 98.
Pascal, remarks on the Unity of Mankind, ii. 27.
Paschasius Radbertus, quoted, i. 250; teaches transubstantiation, i. 329, &c.
Pastoral ministrations, i. 17, 18.
Pentateuch, the Mosaic authorship of the, ii. 74; historical truth of, 75.
Physical science, ii. 6; Prince Metternich on the study of, ib.; relation to faith, 17.
Pope, the, styled Vice-God, ii. 277.
Popes, amendment in the character of the, ii. 269; hostility of, to religious liberty, 271.
Powell, Prof. Baden, Essay on Miracles, ii. 16, 26; his view of miracles, ii. 86.
Prayer for the dead, i. 45.
Prayer Book, assent to, i. 113, 114; resources of the, ii. 155; free use of, i. 224; importance of adhering to the, i. 18.
Prayer meetings, i. 17.
Præmunientes, clause of, i. 210, 213.
Presence, meaning of, ii. 242, 243.
Presence of Christ in the Eucharist, ii. 247; a local, 248.
Presence, spiritual, ii. 357.
Propitiatory, meaning of the term, ii, 165.
Protestantism, misuse of the word, i. 48.
Pusey, Dr., promulges a new canon of discipline for the clergy, ii. 319; his interpretation of the phrase "sacrifices of masses," ii. 192; his "Eirenicon," 175, 192; "The Presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist," i. 266.
Public worship, Royal Commission on, ii. 315; changes introduced in, i. 62; revival of obsolete rites in, 63; importance of avoiding offence in, 64.

Q.

Queen Anne's Bounty, ii. 339.

R.

Ratherius of Verona supports Paschasius' view of the Eucharist, i. 345.
Ratraninus, i. 329, &c., 339, 342, 343; his doctrine of the Eucharist, the same as that of the Church of England, 344.
Real objective presence, the, ii. 241; the visible presence, 313. (See Presence.)
Real presence, meaning of the term, i. 240; Capernaite notion of, 241; Hooker's view of, 246, 248; local limitation of, 270; the phrase foreign to the Church of England, i. 275; real distinguished from natural, ib., 276; importance of acknowledging, 277; importance attached to the doctrines of the, ii. 249.
Reformation, attempts to undo the work of the, i. 57; Romish views of, 284, 285.
Reformers, the, language used respecting them, i, 46, 48.
Regeneration, whether distinct from conversion, i. 163; Hammond's use of the terms, ib.; meaning of, i. 117, 155, 160, 163. (See Baptism.)
Religion, distinction between natural and revealed, ii. 33; in what sense revealed, ii. 79.
Renan, estimate of our Lord's character, ii. 23.
Reserve in communicating religious knowledge, i. 40, 41.
Resurrection of Christ, its place in Christianity, ii. 55.
Revised Code, effects of the, ii. 100; on training colleges, 102; on the labouring classes, 103.
Revision of the Bible, ii. 316.
Ritual, the question of, ii. 145; its past history, 146; lawfulness of ritualistic observances, 147; legal opinion on, 148; how received by Ritualists, ib.; advantage accruing from, 150; debate on, in the Lower House of Convocation, 160; Committee of Convocation on, ii. 180; cases in which judicial proceedings would be necessary, 181; the only remedy suggested, 182; conclusion arrived at, 183; jealousy awakened in Churchmen of an opposite school, 184; Royal Commission on, 252.
Ritualism, missionary aspect of, ii. 153; arguments in support of, 159; symbolism of, 161; spread of, 169; Romeward tendency of, denied, 169; recent phases of, ii. 231; application of the Fine Arts to religion, 232; how far beneficial, 233; the real question at issue, ib.; appointment of a Royal Commission, 237; Romeward tendency of, ii. 177; probable consequences of, in its effect on Churchmen, 178; on Dissenters, 179; a reaction, 183.
Ritualists, extravagant licence of, ii. 149; glaringly deficient in impartiality, ib.; character of the leaders, 157; Romanizing tendencies of, 161; repudiation of Romish doctrine by, 163; vestments, use

of, ii. 151, 152, 159; designs of, ii. 306; tend necessarily to litigation, 307; claims of, to be the followers of the old Tractarians, 308; difference between the two, ib.
Roman Catholic clergy, education of, i. 76.
Romanizing tendencies, i. 188; ii. 160.
Romanism, conversions to, i. 57, 58.
Rome, Church of, has no security against change, i. 185; policy of, 189; secessions to, i. 101; influences at work, i. 106, 107.
Romish aggression, i. 180; controversy, work on, recommended to the Clergy, i. 189.
Romish doctrine, meaning of the term, i. 44; claim to teach, by ministers of the Church of England, i. 57; approximation to, i. 269.
Royal prerogative, exercise of, i. 210.
Rubric, the, i. 54; obedience to, 62, 63; observance of the, i. 67; departures from, i. 16, 17; right of forming an individual opinion upon, ii. 234; bishops cannot modify or dispense with, 236; reconciliation of, with Church practice, ii. 151.
Rural Deans, i. 12; i. 149.
Ruridecanal Conferences, i. 12; possess an advantage over Diocesan Synods, ii. 128.

S.

Sacrament, definition of the word, i. 271; difference between the sacramental symbol, and the sacramental rite, ib.; objective reality in, 277; may be robbed of its specific character, 277; Court at Bath, its exposition of the, 28th and 29th Articles not binding upon the Church, i. 274.
Sacraments, efficacy of, i. 39; doctrine of, in the Catechism, i. 112.
Sacrifice, the propitiatory, of the mass, ii. 165; identical with the doctrine of the Ritualists, 166; contrary to the Church of England, ib.
Sacrifices of masses, and the Sacrifice of the mass, attempt to distinguish between, ii. 192, &c.
Sacrilege, what constitutes, ii. 220.
Sancta Clara, Franciscus a, his interpretation of the 28th Article, i. 241.
Scepticism and credulity, combination of, i. 105.
Scepticism traced to an enlargement of geographical knowledge, ii. 48.
Schism, danger of, i. 5; schools, circulating, i. 20.
School Boards, ii. 336: diocesan return respecting, 337.
Scotch Communion office, i. 280, 281.
Schoolmaster, proper functions of the, ii. 334.
Schools, building of, i. 145; schools, national, how affected by Endowed Schools Bill, i. 365; Mr. Bowstead's report on, 366, &c.; schools, establishment of, i. 314.
Schwarz, Dr. Carl, "Predigten aus der Gegenwart," ii. 55.
Services, provision for special, i. 286, 383; revision of occasional, 390.
Scripture and tradition, i. 103; Scripture, supremacy of, i. 295; infallibility of, 296; relation of, to the Church, 302; grounds of its claim to reverence, 304.
Scripture, divine and human element in, ii. 50; free inquiry in the study of, 61; its relation to tradition, i. 34; how to be interpreted, 35; the principle of the Anglican Church, 36; appeal to antiquity for its interpretation, how to be understood, 36, 37; the sole authoritative source of the faith, 37; language of the Church of England respecting, ii. 70; arguments grounded on, inadmissible in law, 72, 73.
Simon, M. Jules, on Natural Religion, ii. 46.
Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, i. 96, 97, 319.
Spiritual wants of the people, report of Committee of Convocation on, i. 224, 225.
Spirituality, identified with the Church, ii. 133, 141.
St. David's college, Lampeter, i. 10, 94.
St. Francis of Assisi, his authority pleaded against the private mass, ii. 195.
St. Peter, primacy of, ii. 262.
Stanley, A. P., letter on Subscription, ii. 57.
State, relation of, to the Church, ii. 40; duty of the, towards different religious bodies, i. 71; duty of the, in questions of religion, i. 71; may be compelled to support error, 72.
Strauss, view of the person of Christ, ii. 44.
Stuart, Mr., "Thoughts on Low Masses," ii. 196, 198.
Subscription, Clerical, ii. 144; object of the Act, ib.; subscription to the Articles, ii. 37; subscription to formularies, ii. 57; efficacy of, 58; practice among Nonconformists, ib.; in foreign Churches, 59.
Supernatural agency, possibility of, ii. 31; Renan on the meaning of the term, 32.
Surplice, use of the, i. 68.
Syllabus, doctrines of the, ii. 273.
Synod, no means of assembling a national, ii. 136; unfitted for discussing questions

of doctrine, ib.; synods, Gregory Nazianzen on, i. 176; summoned by bishops, 178; synod, the Pan-Anglican, ii. 259, 260; synods, diocesan, ii. 345; revival of, ii. 123, &c.; admission of laymen to, 125; functions of, ib.; relation of a bishop to, 126, 127; purpose for which they are adapted, 129; objects contemplated by their restoration, 130; probable influence on the case of "Essays and Reviews," 131; inefficacy if opposed to the Judicial Committee, 132.

T.

Taylor, Bishop Jeremy, objects to the damnatory clauses of the *Quicunque vult*, ii. 322; on our Lord's human nature, ii. 77; assailed by Mr. MacColl, ii. 352, &c.
Temple, Dr., essay on the Education of the World, ii. 26.
Temporal power of the Pope, probable effect of its loss, ii. 30.
Tendencies of Religious Thought in England, essay on, ii. 49.
Theology and law, ii. 134.
Tradition, its relation to Scripture, i. 34.
Training colleges, bearing of the revised code on, ii. 102; importance of, ii. 335.
Training College, the, at Carmarthen, i. 137.
Transubstantiation, i. 240, 241; two definitions of, by the Council of Trent, 249; affirmed by Paschasius Radbertus, i. 336, &c.; transubstantiation, ii. 242, 281; distinction between the natural *body* of Christ, and the natural *mode* of its existence, 282; Council of Trent on, ib., 283; what is the exact doctrine of the Church of Rome, 283; extravagance of, 287, ii. 163; in what light regarded by the Church of England, 164; metaphysical difficulty involved in, ii. 190-192.
Tract XC., i. 42; its interpretation of the Thirty-first Article, ii. 192.
Tractarian controversy, i. 24; not a subject of universal regret, 25; has called forth valuable literature, ib.; led to a wider study of theology, 26; awakened an earnest practical spirit, ib.; fears entertained respecting it, 27; the controversy not really new, ib.; origin of the Oxford movement, 28; a reaction, 29; system to which it is opposed, 29, 30; differences among those who have engaged in the movement, 31; amount of departure from the doctrines of the Church, 32.
Truth, different aspects of, i. 47.

U.

Unbelief, in what sense sinful, ii. 323-325.
Uniformity, proposed amendment of the Act, ii. 55, 56; Uniformity, Act of, Amendment of the, ii. 340.
Union, necessity of, i. 400; between clergy and laity, ii. 348.
Unity, importance of, i. 100.
Unity of Christendom may be purchased too dearly, ii. 304.
Unity of aim, ii. 349.
Unity of Christendom, Association for the Promotion of the, ii. 170; object of, 171; condemned at Rome, ib.; hopelessness of the scheme, ib.
Unity with Rome, on the basis of common doctrine, ii. 173; difficulties in the way, 174-176; unity of Christendom, ii. 172.

V.

Vatican Council, the, not Œcumenical, ii. 291; convoked under different circumstances from the Council of Trent, 292; excludes a large part of the Christian world, 293; object in convoking, ib.; not free, 294; order of proceeding, 295; pressure exercised by the Pope, 296; character of the Council, 297, ii. 260; not an opportunity for reconciliation with Rome, 264; object of the, 271, 272; Rome, reunion with, ii. 261; not dependent on the Pope, 263; prospect of, 269; duty of English churchmen with regard to the, ii. 275.
Vestments, discussion upon, ii. 239; of the Primitive Church, 240.
Virgin Mary, worship of the, i. 78; prayer to the, ii. 197. (See Immaculate Conception.)
Visitation of the sick, absolution in the office for, i. 394.
Voluntary principle, the, i. 354.
Vulgate, the, imposed by the Church of Rome as authentic scripture, ii. 267.

W.

Wales, moral condition of, i. 132, 133.
Welsh sees, proposal to unite the sees of Bangor and St. Asaph, i. 82, 83.
Welsh language, instruction in, i. 21.
Welsh nonconformity, origin of, ii. 227.
Wilberforce, Archdeacon, on the Eucharist, i. 239; object of the treatise, 242.
William the Conqueror, his ecclesiastical policy, i. 206.
Williams, Rev. Rowland, memorial charging him with false doctrine, i. 291; reasons for not acceding to it, ib.; difficulties involved in the case, 292; distinctions to be kept in view, 293; explanation given by the author, 297; his definition of revelation, 299; doctrine of

inspiration, 300; claims the authority of the Church in his favour, 301; view of the relation of Scripture to the Church, 303, 304; of Judaism to Christianity, 305; of the work of the Holy Spirit, 306; its relation to the incarnation, 307; essay on Bunsen, ii. 30, &c.; philosophy of, 34.

Wilson, Rev. H., essay on National Churches, ii. 35, &c.; relation of the essay to that on Miracles, 48; speech before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, ii. 87.

Word of God, meaning of the phrase, ii. 71.

END OF VOL. I.

PRINTED BY VIRTUE AND CO., LIMITED, CITY ROAD, LONDON.

00023032

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 18 July, 2018